The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE numerous Conferences which have been held during the summer have caused many heart burnings in editorial breasts. It has been quite impossible for them all to be reported adequately and a journal like our own, which appears many weeks after the Conferences, must do the best it can. The Theological Conference of Congregationalists, which has always had special connexion with the *Congregational Quarterly*, was held in Oxford in July. We are not able this year to publish the papers in full, but we believe readers will be glad to have an account of the Conference written by the Rev. John Marsh and an impression by Mr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall. The Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and State had a good press, and as its findings will be the subject of full consideration later we do not offer any report of it now. A personal impression of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh is printed within.

* * *

IN all parts of the country we meet men and women of all parties, and, like ourselves, of none, who deplore the present state of British politics. It is not merely that there is no alternative government at present in sight, but that the lack of an effective Opposition in the two Houses of Parliament is bad for the country. Anything that diminishes respect for Parliament is to-day a matter of special concern, and the divided state of the Front Opposition Bench, its lack of outstanding personalities, and the absence of any representation in the House of Commons of the considerable body of Liberal opinion in the country, are all to be regretted.

This gives point to the effort now being made to establish a People's Front, which should express in some way the varied views labelled "Left" or "Progressive". A contributor in this issue puts the case for such a policy, which is stated with his customary ability by that indefatigable writer, Mr. G. D. H. Cole, in *The People's Front* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Cole deplores the opposition of the official Labour Party to association with Communists and others, for he believes that Fascism is the enemy, and that the whole future of democracy is at stake. All those at ease in Zion, who, when they look at Fascist countries, console themselves with the thought, "It can't happen here", would do well to ponder the present situation. Mr. Cole, who must write in his sleep, is responsible for another timely book, *Practical Economics* (Penguin Books, 6d.), which

studies economic planning as seen in Russia, Germany, Italy, the United States, and Great Britain. In his zeal and speed we hope Mr. Cole will not cease the laudable practice of proof-reading; on p. 39 of the first book there is a mistake in a French tag, and five pages later a mistake in a Wordsworth quotation.

* * *

A WARM welcome is assured in Congregational circles for the Rev. D. K. Clinton's *The South African Melting Pot* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), which he calls "A Vindication of Missionary Policy, 1799-1836". The London Missionary Society has every reason to be proud of its African missionaries; and before the labours of its most distinguished servants, Moffat and Livingstone, Vanderkemp, Read, Campbell, and Philip had blazed the trail. The researches of Prof. W. M. Macmillan have done much to relieve Philip of the charge of being an interfering political partisan, and Mr. Clinton hammers the nail home. It is necessary that this should be done, for, in South Africa especially, the legend that the L.M.S. was a nuisance and more than a nuisance still lives. In a University Common Room recently we happened to sit next to a Colonial scholar. Strangers to each other, the Colour Question seemed a possible subject of conversation. To the inquiry, "What about the influence of the missionaries?" he replied, "Oh, the missionaries have done good work, all except one Society, which has always put wrong ideas into the minds of the natives". We then said, rather to his surprise, "So you think the work of the London Missionary Society and John Philip was not in the best interests of South Africa?" "Decidedly not", he retorted. Further conversation showed that while he knew little at first hand about the work of Vanderkemp and Philip, he had accepted without query the traditional Colonial view.

Reading Mr. Clinton's vindication (The *Evangelical Magazine*, by the way, was not alive in 1792; it was born in the following year) we could not but be struck by the recurrence of the same missionary problems. It is yet a moot question how far missionaries should accept protection from their own governments, and how far they should use force to protect themselves. And still there is need for stress on John Campbell's idea that the missionary must aim at making himself unnecessary:

> when the people in any place are effectually converted to the Christian faith, and have natives among them capable to carry on the work then the Society's and the missionary's object is attained, he will then leave them, and proceed higher up the country, in search of new and uncultivated fields.

Campbell's suggestion of a more effective use of missionary artisans merely needs to be translated into modern terms:

> I would recommend to the Society to make them itinerants to the various new institutions that may be erected; to remain at each

station first, till everything they could do to render the missionaries comfortable should be effected, and on their second circuit, to remain at each circuit till some of the natives were taught their arts, and while these brethren were thus employed, they would also be doing good by their example and counsel.

A campaign is now needed for the sending out, not so much of full-time professional missionaries, as for men and women, in all callings, who will go abroad, as Christians and because they are Christians, to live the Christian life as doctors, tradesmen, teachers, clerks. What Mr. Arthur Mayhew, who knows India so well, recently said about education, is equally true in other spheres:

> I often wonder why educational enthusiasts are content to stay at home . . . Africa requires above all else specialists in every department. There are jobs for every kind of teacher—for the inspector or supervisor; for the training college lecturer; for the master or mistress of method; for the woman specialist in kindergarten, Montessori, domestic science, or child welfare.

* * *

We are grateful to the General Secretary of the L.M.S. for responding to the invitation to discuss in our pages the comments made here last quarter. It is only right to say that Mr. Chirgwin has limited himself to the question of government and administration, leaving the more important considerations of policy and method to be handled later. Readers must decide for themselves whether he has made out his case, which defends the present system whereby the Society's affairs are in the hands of a changing body of 339 people, most of whom would be far from claiming that they are anything like experts in missionary affairs. Mr. Chirgwin falls back on the Report of a Commission of Inquiry in 1927. Some of its recommendations have been put into practice with acknowledged benefit to the Society, but there has been little real increase in co-operation with official Congregationalism, and we scarcely think that the Commission imagined that its labours would produce so little practical result. The General Secretary refers to the "loose relationship" which has been in practice as "satisfactory and effective". If a decreasing income and a deficit of £76,000 is the result of a satisfactory and effective relationship we tremble to think what may have been—or may be.

We agree, however, that these matters of government are of secondary importance compared with policy and method. We hope to learn that the thinking department of the L.M.S. has ready a policy of evangelism which will strike the imagination of its constituency. Is it ready to show the way by which nationalism and proselytization can be reconciled, to show how all the resources of science can be employed in missionary enterprise, and the idea of the indigenous church fully developed? The churches will leap to the

support of their Missionary Societies if they are made to feel that those Societies are living in 1937, using the methods of 1937, and looking forward to 1950. With the faith and courage of the pioneers there must be their readiness to follow the leadership of the Spirit and to adapt methods to meet the new world.

Since the above paragraphs were written we have glanced through the names of the present Directors of the L.M.S. with Mr. Chirgwin's reference to the "surprisingly youthful Board" in mind. It is clear we shall have to revise our ideas both of "surprising" and "youthful". There are, it may be, half a dozen ministerial directors under 40, but it seems doubtful whether there is a single lay director under that age. The average age of the lay directorate would appear to be at least 60. Of the 339 directors we doubt whether more than 39 are under the half century. And this is "surprisingly youthful"!

* * *

EVIDENCE that the plea for the simplification of Church organization frequently urged in these pages is receiving consideration comes from all quarters. Unfortunately on one point at any rate we do not seem to have made ourselves clear. Writing in a recent number of the *Manchester Congregational Monthly* "L.E.C." says:

> At the other extreme we have Dr. Peel's now historic expression of his fear for the future of Congregationalism, in which he sees our Churches reduced by the very stress of circumstances to "house meetings".

In his Chairman's Address to the Lancashire and Cheshire Unions, the Rev. L. H. Gaunt uses the same phrase:

> Dr. Albert Peel has pictured our Churches being reduced by stress of circumstances to mere "house-meetings". That would indeed be tragic!

So far from expressing a fear for the future of Congregationalism we have frequently spoken of Congregationalism as being inevitable! Nor are we aware of using the expression "reduced" in regard to house meetings. We hope, and not fear, that the Church will be released from its bondage to buildings, and so far from that being "reduction" we believe that it will enlarge the Church's cords and strengthen her stakes. We do not see at all where Mr. Gaunt finds "tragedy", for his address goes on:

> But there is nothing ignoble in a Church *beginning* as a house-meeting. Such a Church would stand in a most honourable and apostolical succession. Wherever there are a few like-minded Christian people (not necessarily belonging to the same denomination) who for one reason or another are cut off from regular Church attendance, might they not be brought together in some convenient room for a brief session of worship and devotion on Sunday mornings or evenings?

> I think I am right in saying that during the Apostolic and post-Apostolic period, right on for at least a century after the death of the Apostles, there were very few, if any, buildings set apart for Christian worship. The Christians met either in one another's houses, or in hired rooms, lecture halls and the like.
>
> And this was the period, as Dr. Glover has so forcefully reminded us, in which Christianity grew so amazingly—underground, as it were, out of sight, not with observation—grew so that suddenly (as it seemed), a Christian teacher could write to a heathen friend at Rome and say triumphantly, "You can't crush us now. We're everywhere!"

Would Mr. Gaunt regard it as tragic were Christianity once again to grow "amazingly" and Christians rejoice "triumphantly"? Of course not. But an essential pre-requisite is that the churches should put first things first, their evangelizing purpose before the maintenance of their buildings. When hundreds of churches employ all their energy in running their machines without winning a single outsider for Christ the need for drastic reformation is surely obvious.

Here is a town with some 13,000 people. It has one Congregational, one Baptist, three Methodist, one Free Church of England, two Anglican, and two Roman Catholic churches, most of them with school buildings. On almost any Sunday morning one of the six Free Churches would hold all the congregations, which would perhaps overflow to a second building in the evening. Most of the buildings are not opened from one week-end to another.

Within a radius of a quarter of a mile in a London borough are also six Free Churches, magnificent buildings some of them. All the work now being done in them could be done in two of them, with increased impact on the neighbourhood.

There were times in the history of Christianity when buildings were a primary need, say the first half of the nineteenth century in England; there are areas now in this country where new church buildings seem to be the immediate step necessary for an effective Christian witness. But to go on for ever as if buildings of the old type and the old number are a *sine qua non*, ignoring all the changes in the environment of organized religion, is simply riding for a fall. In the Church of the future as we see it there will be much fewer buildings, in each of which there will be great variety in forms of worship. That worship will conserve the values there are in preaching and united praise and prayer. Attached to these buildings (which, of course, will belong to all denominations) will be a large number of small groups of people, small enough to make their fellowship a reality and to share each other's joys and sorrows, aspirations and needs. Some members of the Church will be set apart for preaching and the conduct of worship, some for the work of religious education, some for pastoral work (including fully qualified physicians

for psychotherapy), some for Young People's Societies. Probably one or two men and women will be full time, maintained by the fellowship, but they will be an exception, for the fullest use will be made of those with special gifts who now make little specific contribution to the Church's witness. It may be that they will be ordained for their special tasks and the Colleges (greatly reduced in number and serving all denominations) will have frequent short courses for them. Full use will be made, too, of all modern inventions—the wireless, for training classes and teachers' discussions and other joint "listening-in"; the gramophone and the film will also be employed. The resources of the Church will not be exhausted as they are now by the maintenance of buildings and the professional ministry. They will be available for good works generally, for the provision of a sound religious education for adults and children (which no one claims is given to-day), and for the work of evangelism at home and abroad. On these lines the missionary societies will find a policy which is at one and the same time forward looking and aggressive. Their technique on the mission field, too, will be brought into line. The Clark Bands will be used, the professional ministry will sink into the background, the indigenous church will continually expand. It is right to learn from an enemy, and the following paragraphs in the Rev. W. W. Cash's *Christendom and Islam* are full of significance:

> In marked contrast to the Christian Church Islam has no priesthood. It is from first to last a lay movement, and most of its educational and propaganda work is carried on voluntarily. It has not been necessary for Islam to found missionary societies, for every Moslem, wherever he is, is expected to bear his personal witness to his faith.
>
> The position in Egypt to-day affords a good illustration of the Moslem method of propaganda. In every year during the past decade from 500 to 1,000 Christians have become Moslems. This cannot be said to be due to persecution or the sword. It is largely due to the lay voluntary witness of Moslems to their faith, but it is greatly helped by the decadent condition of the Coptic Church. If the Coptic Church had instituted a simple *kuttah* system in which the Bible well-taught was the principal subject, no doubt the results would have been very different. The lesson to be learnt from the Moslem method of holding converts, training them and making them witnesses, is of first-rate importance to the Christian missionary enterprise. In the conflict with Islam a contributory cause of the failure of Christianity was the priestcraft of the Church, the unpopularity of the clergy, and the absence of any adequate lay expression in the religious life of the people. In distinction to this, Islam found a growing strength as it expanded in its lay character. It was a religion of the people, its religious services were conducted by laymen and its mosques were under lay control.

* * *

THE Sixth International Congregational Council meets in the United States in 1940. It seems a long cry to that date, but preliminary preparations are already being made. The sooner Congregationalists throughout the world set to work the better, for Congregationalism has a real contribution to make at the present time. It is perhaps not as easy for Congregationalism to give an ecumenical lead such as the Anglican Church does through the Lambeth Conference, but in these days when freedom and democracy are under a cloud the Congregational Churches have something to say which the world needs.

The last two International Councils have much to teach us. The Fourth met at Boston, and the Reports of the Commissions in preparation for it contain a mine of information. It was a pity that the arrangements, especially the impossible hall for speaking, did not allow these Commission Reports to receive the consideration they deserved. The Fifth Council, held at Bournemouth in 1930, was a great success from the point of view of social intercourse, but it did not make any great contribution to the life of the denomination itself or give any particular lead to religion in general. The Sixth Council is to be held at Wellesley College and will meet in much more suitable conditions than the Fourth, and the American hosts are particularly anxious that the Council should not fail in any way.

Our own pages will, in some future few issues, incorporate some of the preparations for the Council Meeting.

* * *

PITT, on becoming Prime Minister at the age of 23, visited Cambridge, where he was much flattered by Churchmen who had their eyes on the livings in his gift. Observing this the preacher in Great St. Mary's on the following Sunday took as his text, "There is a lad here which hath five barley loaves and two small fishes, but what are they among so many?"

* * *

ONE of the best misprints we have seen for some time is that describing the Black Hole of Calcutta, where Surajah Dowlah "threw 150 Englishmen into a dark dungeon with one small widow, and in the morning only 23 staggered out alive".

And this is from Dr. Rufus Jones:

> A little boy in Sunday school was asked by his teacher what lesson he got from the story of the Good Samaritan. "The lesson I get from it", he said, "is that when you are in trouble your neighbours ought to help you".

PROGRESSIVE CONCERT?

By Louis Borrill.

It bodes ill for a democracy when no one of the political parties is able to give the majority of the electorate what it wants. If this state of public opinion is permeated by emotional anxiety attendant upon apparently imminent war, the situation is grave and demands the utmost political realism from those who care for peace and democracy. This is the impasse of the British people: this is the demand made upon British democrats. Like the situation of 1931—a threat to the national life and democratic spirit which had to be met by a national effort—this situation of 1935-7, with its threat of war and fascism, demands, too, a national effort for the accomplishment of urgent tasks. So it appears now to minds of many colours and castes. They advocate a brake upon some of the tendencies set in motion by the previous national effort, if they (economic nationalism in particular) are not to destroy us. The corrective proposed is a re-orientation of the British political party system to admit, on the Spanish and French models, of a federation of progressive societies and individuals, which would focus progressive opinion by the appeal for, and achievement of, urgent reforms, to provide a revivified opposition to the National Government's drift.

Among progressive opinion the idea has long been at work. Progressives lost their chance at the last election of unseating the Government, and there is not now time for its term of office to run out, and for its replacement by an alternative Government, before irreparable damage will have been done. So, it is argued, by the united opposition of the People's Front movement to present dangerous tendencies, and its substitution of peaceful constructive measures, such pressure could be brought upon the Government as would give it no excuse for pursuing its own narrow policy on the excuse that only it knows its own mind. Or such pressure could be brought to bear upon it as would force an election.

This idea has had from the very first considerable sway in the Labour and Socialist political parties. At the 1936 Labour Party Conference at Edinburgh, the People's Front idea appeared in the proposal of the Railway Clerks' Association for a programme of certain social reforms which would unite progressives. The Communists showed the idea working in them in their proposal for affiliation to the Labour Party. The Liberals, too, are welcoming it. A strong body of them is working devotedly for it, men of the stamp of Sir Walter Layton, Mr. Richard Acland, Mr. Wilfred Roberts, and Mr. A. J. Cummings. Their following is large among the young Liberals in such bodies as the National League of Young Liberals.

Strong, too, for progressive unity are the younger Conservatives, especially the young M.P.'s. Mr. Vyvyan Adams and Captain Harold MacMillan typify these. They belong to the all-party Next Five Years Group, a prime advocate of democratic unity. Most of the minor progressive political parties, such as the Independent Socialist Party, and the bigger progressive movements such as the Co-operative Party and the National Peace Council, are potential constituents of a federation of progressives. Only from the official Opposition, the Labour Party, has come real opposition, but, with the votes at the Easter conferences of big trade unions for trade union and working-class participation in a democratic alliance, that is wilting. To be added to all this is the growing realization among progressives of the need for non-party opposition to the present Government. Such people want a movement which shall sponsor the needs and express the hopes of the manual worker, the middle-class progressive, the technician, the scientist, the Christian, and the progressive of no party affiliation, and embody the hopes and aspirations of women in their *rôle* of workers and mothers; in short, an opposition is required that will aim at bringing our social order more into line with the conscious aspiration of Christians and the largely inarticulate because unconscious hopes of the mass of the people for a more humane order. Common needs these millions have, but no opposition large and unified and elastic enough exists to express their distrust of the National Government, and to mobilize sufficiently strong opposition either to compel another course upon the Government, or turn it out if it will not listen.

Manifestly the present position requires a non-party effort to realize the aspirations of decent men and women, the instrument to effect which democracy now lacks. Decidedly, most of us do not want a state of affairs such as Sir John Orr, the famous dietician, describes—approximately 20,000,000 people insufficiently fed, housed, and clothed while the nation prepares to spend £1,500,000,000 upon armaments which give no guarantee of security.

The necessary instrument is the coalition of peace lovers and democrats. Such a tool is already in use, rapidly dislocating party loyalties, and stultifying the catchwords of professional politicians. Its appeal has been strong enough to woo the extreme doctrinaires of the left to support of "merely" liberal aims and to have brought together in intelligent co-operation, Liberals, Communists, Conservatives, peace lovers, Christians, atheists, Roman Catholics, Jews, and progressives of many single persuasions.

The disintegration of party loyalties which association in politics for specific aims is working is now very prominent. A common feature of our political life now is the mass meeting at which Liberals, Communists, Christians, Conservatives, and people of no party alignment speak on a common platform, *e.g.*, for the Spanish

Government, against the Means Test. Procedure in the House of Commons shows a similar tendency: several times the Government has had as much opposition to its measures from its own followers as from the Labour Opposition: even the steam roller of the Party machine breaks down against the united support of progressive M.P.'s for progressive measures.

One great measure of the realization of the need for progressive concert is the existence of many local People's Front committees. These small united fronts are popularizing the idea as they practise it. Springing directly from the needs and wishes of democrats, they are the real mouthpiece of democracy and its chief proponents to-day. In fact, wherever the official Opposition's policy has not met the wishes of local progressives as expressed through their committees, the committees have reinforced it, and made themselves the opposition. This was proved by the National Hunger March, when, in spite of official Labour indifference towards the marchers, these local groups fought for and co-ordinated efforts on their behalf, and so effectively spoke for them throughout the country that other progressives, among them hitherto tardy Labour and Trade Union leaders, not to be outdone and goaded by the glamour, supported them too.

A tactical precedent was thus set for the means by which progressives could be united; by propaganda for common aims. Thus too, spurred and backed by wide popular protests, the vigorous leadership of democracy was produced.

All this, some may say, may be true. The Popular Front idea may be progressing and the embryo fronts in many districts doing valuable work, but it does not logically follow that the formation of a National People's Front is a wise or desirable development. Some "gingering" of the democratic parties may be needed to reinforce in them concern for democratic aims, but is it necessary to set up these committees everywhere, to destroy the identity of the traditional political parties in such a move? Cannot one of the parties invite affiliation for co-operation on an emergency programme? The answers to these objections are: (1) The People's Front has in the committees the new instruments for the solution of the new problems by which we are faced. (2) A People's Front programme—a non-party programme—can alone satisfy the wishes of many people for non-party measures; (3) The People's Front will not impair in any way the identity of its constituents or their freedom to criticize it and each other.

Furthermore, there is such urgent necessity for achieving certain dearly conceived aims that, despite those objections which may perhaps be brought against the proposed tool, they are inconsiderable beside the improvement it could achieve. We have to remember that the forces opposing our desires are strong enough to withstand almost indefinitely any isolated pressure for them except the over-

whelming thrust which a People's Front could muster, and that we should do well, therefore, to see what it is to which we resign ourselves when we refuse a concerted move by progressives.

In the international sphere, for instance, we must be prepared for a repetition of the disastrous events which have discredited the last few years. The Fascist treaty-revisionist war offensive will go on and increase, for as the Fascist threat to the peace of the world assumes more menacing proportions with the illustration of its new war technique in Spain and its repetition in Central and Eastern Europe, so world democracy makes its legal obligations to the Spanish Government a "scrap of paper", and by such tactics encourages Hitler to further Spanish adventures in Czecho-slovakia. The German Nazis, though not alone in such plans, but certainly foremost, make war on new lines. Germany maintains in close touch with German embassies abroad a vast spy and Nazi "revolutionary corps" whose business is in every country pro-German propaganda and, in strategic and Germanic countries, Nazi revolution. Organizing a rebellion in a strategic country by a reactionary party, or the "revolutionary corps", the Nazis proclaim themselves allies and abettors of the rebels with arms, "volunteers", and diplomatic recognition, in their struggle against "world Bolshevism". These tactics are being developed in Czechoslovakia, Central Europe's remaining democracy. It does not ease this situation when Britain proposes a Western European defensive pact which shall exclude Czechoslovakia entirely from its provisions. The resulting collective insecurity, and our position on the slippery slope to war, is the logical outcome of the Government's refusal to maintain its election pledge of support for the Collective Security system of the League of Nations. For we would do well to remember the National Government's friendship for Fascism in connexion with its boast that it wants its arms to defend democracy. We should remember that it was the National Government which threw China to Japan, Abyssinia to Mussolini, and Spain to the two dictators. It ratified German naval re-armament, armed Germany, and financed German re-armament. So sabotaging the ideal of Collective Security, the Government had a good excuse for taking refuge in security (*sic*) by re-armament which is to cost £1,500,000,000 perhaps *plus* . . . .

In internal affairs, the Government has made little progress in measures which build an enlightened democracy. Even its most ardent supporters cannot deny their own misgiving over its handling of the distressed areas. Rehousing lags; educational expenditure is restricted. Even if one is prepared to ignore its failure in many spheres, it is difficult to ignore the spectacle of Mr. Baldwin admitting his equivocation upon the armaments question ("If I had gone to the electorate and told them that great armaments were needed, do you think they would have returned me?") without

questioning its right to the confidence of the nation. This, and the related tendency of high-handed executive action by politicians without public sanction for such action, coupled with the accelerated erosion of the liberal State which the National Government has effected during its terms of office, has intensified a dangerous post war tendency. It seems more than a coincidence that as the Government fails in many spheres to express the will of the mass of the people, it passes such potentially reactionary legislation as the Trades Disputes Act, the Sedition Bill, and the Public Order Bill, which curb the power of the people to make their voice heard—and incidentally to protest against the Government's prowess.

The official Opposition leaders, too, have shown lately a dangerous new tendency. They have become lethargic and hesitant to the extent that upon some of the major issues they do not express the views of the opposition in the country. The Party's declarations of policy often conflict with its actions—to the unconcealed joy of the reactionaries, or it tamely submits to whatever Government views seem "practicable and feasible". Thus it paralyses democratic forces. Thus it drives into support of the Government people who do not believe in it but choose it as a lesser evil than an Opposition which inspires no confidence. Hesitation among progressives naturally follows, while the Conservative Central Office and Sir Oswald Mosley march on like sleep-walkers. The confusion of progressive elements in the population increases when the kinetic forces come thus increasing from the extreme right. With the Fascists actively agitating the political stalemate "right" leadership is threatened. They steal the thunder of the supine progressive parties with their cry for "action" and ever "action". Especially strong among the young is their appeal to violence and for "strong government which will end the muddle". Helpless amid the unchecked rush of events, it is hardly to be wondered that many people become distressed and incoherent enough to give support to violence politics or persuade themselves to agree to government paternalism running away into "strong government", as it now seems likely to do.

Thus grave is the position; but its gravity, and its remedy, are understood. More and more widely they are being understood: the remedy especially, note its popularity. This is largely because the remedial Federation of Progressives has the triple merits of popularity, expediency, and priority. It is the natural outcome of a natural tendency among progressives only just finding a voice: for instance, a study by the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals, through its Committee to Study Progressive Movement, has revealed a body of about 12,000 progressives actually working for the several aims of a People's Front, and eager for wider co-operation with other similarly minded people.

Their efforts and those of the aggregate millions in the Labour

Party, the Churches, the Unity Socialist Parties, the Co-operative Party, the Trade Unions, the League of Nations Union, the Y.W.C.A., the Y.M.C.A., the Women's Institutes, the anti-Fascist Jews, the socially conscious rationalists, the radical liberals, and the progressive professional, trade, and other organizations, are focused upon a simple programme designed to achieve peace, social justice, and preserve democracy: in fact all who desire a short and immediately practicable programme of urgent measures, could be invited to co-operate.

Alone the Labour Party could provide this opportunity by inviting unity of all working-class political parties, progressive forces, and progressives upon a popular programme. Of course, the details of the programme would involve concession and discussion, but there seems little question that agreement could be reached upon some such aims as these: 1. Extension of the Franco-Soviet Pact to include Britain and any country (not excluding Germany, Japan, and Italy) which liked to join to provide the basis for a new League of Pooled Security, open to all. 2. Reform of the League to make it a dynamic organization for economic co-operation rather than a *status quo* organization. 3. Abolition of Family Means Test; revivification of distressed areas and a policy of increased production and increase in the standard of living; a forty hour week and a minimum wage; a National Housing Plan, combined with a big programme of public works. 4. Suppression of recent anti-democratic legislation and Fascist armed forces and their foreign allies in this country; democratization of the police and the army. 5. Nationalization of arms traffic and subsidiary industries; institution of a National Medical Service; nationalization of mines. 6. Extension of democratic liberties. 7. A greater humanization of government and the law; an increase in and reform of education which shall be humanitarian and non-militarist. Such a programme would provide a basis of agreement for hesitating millions of people.

The records of the People's Fronts in France and Spain argue well for the work of a British People's Front. M. Blum's vigorous leadership, born of his energetic support by the mass of the people, made possible a series of social reforms which have proved that democracy is no "putrifying corpse" once democrats support democracy. Regarding the Spanish People's Front, one should bear in mind that it was the factional nature of Spanish political life—stemmed tragically late by the People's Front—which allowed the military clique to plot and encouraged their hope of an easy *coup*. It was too, the Spanish People's Front Government's attempted solution of some of the pressing social problems, notably the agrarian question, which touched off the rebellion.

While a People's Federation upon the model of the French and Spanish experiments may attract through its aims, there can be no

question of slavish imitation of their methods and constitutions. Certain ideas and developments, however, are common to them and any movements which sponsor democratic federation. One of these is the unification of working-class political organizations. The French Communists joined with the French Socialists before combining with the Radical Socialists, and in this country the Communist Party, the Socialist League, and the Independent Labour Party, following their recent pact, are pressing for labour unity through affiliation to the Labour Party. Another detail common to France and Britain in the journey towards a People's Front is the role of the intellectual in People's Front propaganda. In France the birth and growth of the idea of unity owed much to intellectuals like Alain, Rivet, Malraux, Gide, and Langevin, and to the *Comité de Vigilance Contre le Fascism et la Guerre*. In Britain also there has been an early advocacy for it by a number of men prominent in various intellectual spheres (Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, and Professor Julian Huxley among them) in their recent manifesto to the press calling for the unity of progressives "for the defence of the principles common to them all", which anticipates the agreement likely to be born among people with less intellectualized and, therefore, less individualized differences.

The French experiment has demonstrated how necessary it is that the unity of national progressive forces should be the result of the expression through local committees of the urgent needs of the people, and their co-operation for them with other local opinion similarly organized. For this is the only way in which the People's Front can be kept the instrument of the popular will as distinct from an alliance between political parties for their own purposes. Thus all over France before the Blum Government's victory there were people's local committees, much like the Peace Councils of this country, and representing all local liberalism, in order that the candidates they chose to stand for them should be representative more of the people than of the political parties to the pact.

Of particular significance is the support the progressive middle-classes are showing for progressive federation, in view of recent reactionary advance. They see what Fascist *régimes* mean for their sons' and daughters' business and professional opportunities, and for their own liberty and standard of life, how too they decide whether or no their lives are to be used for peace and reconstruction or destroyed in war. So motivated, the French lower middle-class and middle-class ranged themselves with M. Blum and his Government. Parallel with the French development will come the adhesion of the small shopkeeper and small business man to a popular progressive policy, if it is available. Many small business people are still living in the illusions of pre-war times and their hopes of Selfridge-like futures, but an important section is feeling the grip of the trusts, and conse-

quently developing grievances. In revolt against "the banks" which finance the trusts, and deceived by Fascist denunciation of "bank usury", they are easy recruits for Fascism, unless of course, their plight finds advocate and redress in the policy of a People's Front, as in France. Likewise with youth, Fascism's storm-troops now in many countries. Many people think that it is folly to allow youth's radicalism to be exploited by Fascism, though that is what will happen and *is* happening without much check to it. Yet the young will especially respond to any movement that is freed from sectarian shackles and drags, for it will be able to generate generous political idealism.

The palliation of one of the chief defects of democratic political systems is to the credit of the French People's Front. For under these systems, despite a widely circulated popular press and a national broadcasting system to disseminate information and ideas, each political party, progressive society, and faction necessarily sets itself up as the "one true church", and consequently all suffer the disabilities heir to this condition. By progressive federation, however, through the national and local linking of progressives which it will bring, the sects will be brought together to discuss, debate, write, and think among themselves, and disseminate ideas and information collectively. Instead of preaching to the converted as they have done for years, they will talk to and be talked at by a much wider circle, and a real chance will be given for the fraternity they advocate to develop. The Liberals, for instance, will get a chance to liberalize the Communists; Christians a chance to import the ethical tinge to politics which many people think it needs; the Communists to stimulate the Liberals; and the Labour Party in controversy with other groups will be made to re-think and re-state, precisely and popularly, its fundamental beliefs. For the first time too, the intellectuals will get a chance of reaching audiences other than small intellectual audiences and literary coteries. Progressives will learn each other's tongues.

What will be the effect of a big body of people thus occupied upon the "lunatic fringe" and the "floating vote"? The former may be steadied, the latter may be impressed, and, responding as it always does to courageous initiative or superior political skill, may well join the People's Front and bring its independence, individuality, and initiative to its service. From such federation it may well be asked what might not be expected. A new spirit of inquiry and compromise may be borne to transform British political life. In fact such by-products are some of the most cogent arguments for federation.

THE PREACHER AS TEACHER.

By Dr. Frederick K. Stamm, Brooklyn.

It is not the purpose of this paper to go into the subject of religious education. That is a field in itself, and I have no desire to roam about in an atmosphere which belongs distinctively to those whose training and experience give them a right to speak. Further, the teacher of religion, or for that matter, the teacher of anything, need not delude himself with the thought that any great number of people are going to follow his spoken word. It isn't so with the parent in the home. In fact, the wise parent will do well to teach as little as possible by precept, and as much as possible by example. It isn't so with the teacher of youth. There was a time when I thought I could take a class of boys and girls who were candidates for church membership, and give them correct ideas of God by teaching them who He is, what He is, where He is. But boys and girls draw their own pictures of God, and about all we can do is to help them complete the outline. There is much in this statement which may require explanation. But there is still much truth in the statement that "religion is *caught,* not taught".

It isn't so with the teacher of adults. One of my men said to me recently: "You must not expect us to assimilate all you say from the pulpit. If we can get one-fifth of it we shall do well. We are too damn dumb, and besides we are little children just learning to walk. But there is one thing we can catch—your enthusiasm, your consecration, your love". I liked that statement and it set me thinking that after all people *are* hungry sheep looking up waiting to be fed, rather than wolves to pounce upon the teacher of religious truth and rend him to pieces. And yet, I am not declaring that people in the pews are divine—divine in the sense of being ready to smack their chops over the sweet morsel of Gospel food. If our teaching is only pap, and the sermon only an essay stewed in cream, if it does not make people writhe and squirm and feel decidedly uncomfortable, there is little in it that can be called wholesome. But I want that teaching to proceed from a man in the pulpit whose heart burns with righteousness, and whose love for people becomes the dynamic behind his utterances. As in John the Baptist's day, perhaps men will not mind being called "vipers" by a man in whom they know there is a fire which only God can kindle.

Then, too, we had better not talk about the preacher as teacher before saying something about the qualifications of the teacher. I am not thinking about his academic training. In this day we assume all that. I am thinking especially of his ability to discern spiritual truth. There is a lot of lying in the pulpit, not always consciously so,

but nevertheless lying, and in consequence a leading of the people away from those abiding conceptions of religious truth that surged in the soul of Jesus. What I mean is the inability to discern the great facts and truths of life in the midst of crises and in a day when it is comparatively easy to follow the trend of popular opinion.

To give a concrete example, compare, if you please, the insight into what war meant which Jane Addams had in a day when most men were calling her a traitor, and the manner in which many a pulpiteer was trying to reconcile the teachings of Jesus with our entrance into the Great War. Walter Millis, in *The Road to War,* gives us a startling picture of the marches in New York—the cheering crowds and the greatest applause that "went to the battalion of 130 Clergymen, in clerical garb and American flags". How the New York churches had decided to "mobilize its Christian strength behind President Wilson". How the ministers proclaimed the *holy war* from many pulpits. "It was a performance echoed in countless other cities".

We talk about men being spokesmen of God, but the kind of spokesmen the Church needs are those who in dark hours, in times of crisis, can discern the signs of the times, and who are able to match their spiritual wits against the superficial interpretation of religion. The Church cannot afford to repeat its mistake. All our talk in times of quiet and peace as to what we will do when the time of danger arrives is so much clanging brass and tinkling of cymbals alongside the steady eyes and the perfect willingness to speak the truth in humility and the readiness to take what comes in the path of duty. Listen to the words of Hemingway in an article:

> *I was first in war, now I would be the last* . . . My religion is gone. I have nothing to tie to spiritually, not a remnant of the romance of Church and Sunday School nurtured in me by my parents. I cannot hear a sermon to-day without the thought: Perhaps that man prating his false doctrine of "Love thy neighbour" preached to other boys that they did right to kill. Perhaps he blessed the day my dearest friend was blown to bits and said: "Well done, thou good and faithful carrion".

There never was a day when we needed the mystic as we do to-day —a mysticism that is a dynamic, not a passive mood. Its essence must be the feeling of God in the heart, a feeling which is harmonious with the God behind the universe. Not a dreamer, not a visionary, but a man who feels impelled to work out in the world what he feels in the depths of his own soul. God visits mankind by exceptional men. When a preacher is ready for the vision, God grants it. God is always shining forth through the universe, and whenever souls are luminous enough to carry that eternal light, first into their own consciousness, and then out to the consciousness of others, there a prophet and teacher has happened. It is the thing that Emerson

meant by "a first-hand acquaintance with Deity", what Carlyle meant by a knowledge of God "otherwise than by hearsay", and what Dr. L. P. Jacks calls "elemental religion", its birth a "wind that bloweth where it listeth".

Some time ago in radio talks I took occasion to deal quite frankly with some of the New Testament miracles. After discussing the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, I received a letter from an educated woman in the Middle West. In the course of her letter she asked the rather significant question, "Why do so many preachers preach, why don't they teach?" She explained her question by remarking that she was fed up on abstractions, and that she felt large numbers of people would be happy to be treated to a dose of sane, vital instruction in the art of living without dragging in by the ears a lot of extraneous matters which have nothing to do with the religion of Jesus.

One may well take account of that sort of barbed thrust, for after all it is people, not buildings and altars and money, that constitute the Church; and after we have named all the other functions of the Church, we must come back to the acknowledgment that the Church is essentially an educational institution, the spiritual university of the human race, and its ministers not apologists for decadent dogmas, but teachers, *illuminati* of the hidden powers in men, the revealers of men to themselves, and challengers of personal commitment to the God idea.

There are tools in the hands of the teacher of religion, tools by the use of which he may be able to take this sorry scheme of things entire in our ecclesiastical, economic, and individual life, and mould it somewhere near to the desire of the teacher's consecrated heart and intellect. And without a proper handling of those tools his people will remain ignorant and unresponsive to the deepest claims of the Christian religion.

I.

I should name the first of these tools, the Bible. To the preacher who had the courage, during the past fifteen years, to cling to the belief that the Bible ought still to be read and might profitably be used as the foundation of preaching and teaching, it comes as a source of encouragement now to pick up an article such as "The Bible for our Times" by Bruce Curry in *Religion in Life*, and to hear George Herbert Betts say,

> The Bible is not outmoded. It is abundantly rich in reproducible experiences of supreme worth, which teachers of religion should help the young to discover and appreciate. If Christianity is to survive and do its part in rebuilding the discordant world, the Bible must be saved as the central source of guidance to the fountains of spiritual power.

Somehow our fear lest we might put too much emphasis upon the authority of a book has changed to the fear of losing the Bible altogether. One morning, so runs an old story, England woke up and found that the Bible was gone. Not only had the Bible been lost, but all trace of its influence, and every echo of its music, had disappeared from life. The result was appalling. People did not know what the great writers were talking about. Shakespeare was almost unintelligible. Ruskin's works resembled an ancient tapestry. Everyday speech stammered and faltered. A change passed over the whole tone and temper of the nation. Life became hectic and vulgar, all the old restraints were let loose, and every instinct ran wild. No one could distinguish values, and life became narrow and mean, tedious, trivial, frivolous, and more frequently, drab. Some fine, high quality had taken its departure from life. Something like that has been happening in our Churches. We are faced with an amazing spectacle—a generous, charming, candid, and frank generation without the knowledge of Biblical literature.

Whether the situation in America is more serious to-day than it has ever been may well be questioned. We know that the various parts of the Bible are recognized as not of equal value and authority. And to many the Bible means less than it did a generation ago. With all our scientific knowledge we find a number of liberal-minded people who are offended in their reason by tall stories—of the sun standing still, of axe heads floating, of fiery furnaces that do not burn, of ravens that carry food to the seer—who are likely to lose precious truths by rejecting them along with the legendary.

But the Bible will for ever remain the preacher's great textbook, and I cannot help but express the wish that for once the preacher in his teaching ministry would lay aside the accustomed mental habits of the Christian and look at the Bible with fresh eyes as though he had for the first time in all his life come upon this Book. Suppose in our maturity we could get away from the instinctive thought of it as "a book". Suppose we could think of it as a collection of books, sixty-six of them, and then like a boy or a girl for whom the parent had laid a good book on the table in the hope that the youth would read it, we stumbled on each one of these books, picked it up, and like any other book, allowed it to speak its message!

It would be something to us, and it would do something to the people who sit under our instruction which had never been done before. I have lately been reading a biography of Martha Berry of the Mt. Berry school in Georgia. Her sisters went to college, she wouldn't go. Her sisters married, she cared little for marriage. But one day several little poor white children came to her. She read to them. Next week others came, and from that grew Mt. Berry College. She became its President, noted men visited the school and became supporters of it. And in concluding the account of

Martha Berry's success in this educational project the biographer observes: "Her mind was unfettered by tradition and custom, and her school not hampered by ancient tradition. She fitted the education to those who came to her and fitted the plant to the necessities about it".

Some such freedom of the mind and spirit ought to take hold of the preacher as he sits down before this collection of books. He could well afford to unfetter his mind and loose himself from much of what he has learned of ancient interpretations through the seminary curriculum.

One thinks in this connexion of Ann Byrd Payson in her book, *I Follow the Road.* After she had stepped out into a new light she was talking one day to a friend about it all. She was asked what her technical exercise was in finding the truth of Christianity. She replied that she went to the life of Jesus to find out what He first said to those who for the first time came to know Him. What did He say to Nicodemus and to the man with the withered hand? Her friend thought she had chosen a queer way to read the Bible. But she replied, "I think it would be ridiculous for me to read it as if I were accustomed to the mental habits of Christians, or as if I knew all the characters upon whom the mind of Christ had risen like a moon of mercy and a sun of mandate. Everyone knows bits of His teaching, but they swim about in our memories like fish in the garden pools; we admire them, sometimes in the light of poetic adjustment they sparkle, but we never catch them to live by. They have for us at most the use of impersonal beauty".

I think our whole attitude would change, our congregations would see a light such as they had never seen on land or sea before, if we would come to the Bible with fresh eyes, and then dare to say what we see. I shall never forget what Dr. John Hutton said about Jesus in a little exposition of the Syrophoenician woman:

> And when our Lord did speak, what was it he said? "I have only been sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel". Now these, I firmly hold, are not His words at all. They are, so to speak, a quotation to be read within inverted commas, a quotation embodying the prevailing temper of their Jewish minds . . . . is there any man living who will try to convince me that Jesus said that? Were I convinced that Jesus said that, meaning every word of it, I should have to close my New Testament and go out into the darkness.

One thing we've got to face with this present generation which we have never yet been ready to face, and that is, that many things which are claimed as true have no historical basis. If the Church is to go on as an educational institution, this must be accepted. The disruption that is happening in the Church to-day is due to intellectual

cowardice. We have too many doubting Thomases, disciples who are afraid of the facts.

A word ought to be said about the strategy of our teaching. I have high regard for expository preaching, but it must be inductive, and if we are to win the man of to-day to the truths of faith we must use the method by which he finds truth in other fields. In an age of inquiry, when the authority of the Bible and the Church is questioned, the old formula of expounding the meaning of a text does not carry conviction. The inductive method is necessary in an age when the minds of men deplore all dogma and "love disembodied ideas that float in vapoury phrases in the air, binding us to nothing positive". We must begin with nearby facts familiar to men. It was the method of Jesus, as we see in all His parables. He knew that men were discoverers, and not least in the things of the spirit. He really used only one text, a text which is profounder than all philosophies and the fulfilment of every faith—God is love; but He never quoted it, and He never assumed that men accepted it. He began with facts around Him and presented them with exquisite art—a man giving bread to his child, a farmer pulling his ox out of the pit, a father receiving his prodigal son, a wayside flower, a childish game, a wedding party : all life at His touch became an infinite truth. And we must see in the end that He used this same method in speaking to the stranger, the doubter, and the sinner.

II.

But the preacher has a second tool—the most significant part of the Bible—the idea of the Kingdom of God as set forth in the teaching of Jesus. A few years ago an unlettered man in my church, an eminently successful industrialist, asked me one morning at the close of the church worship to come to his home that evening. I went. He said, "You spoke pretty directly this morning on the Kingdom of God. I admire you for it. You know my life and my background. Now please sit down and tell me more. God knows I want to do the right thing by my fellowmen. I know what it is to toil from morn to night, and somehow I must do what the Gospel says". Well, that man has not moved out of the capitalistic system, but I think I never met a man who so earnestly sought to find the right path for his feet. It is possible to set forth an argument in defence of the Kingdom of God as an external manifestation, or in defence of a personal inner disposition as indicated by Jesus when he said, "The Kingdom of God is within you". But all such arguments have got us nowhere. Just as there is no such thing as giving a detailed satisfactory explanation of everything in your world or mine, so it will ever remain futile to attempt to open the mind of Jesus and see all that was embodied in His utterances concerning the Kingdom of God. What He does give us is a working hypothesis, an ideal which we set out to verify

in experience. I know that in my own thinking and in my own attempt at an ideal toward which my ministry of teaching must move this Kingdom of God must take precedence over all others. It must cut underneath denominationalism; upon that altar must be sacrificed personal ambition; and every question of race, ecclesiastical procedure, and social relationships must be held up before the searching light of the teachings of Jesus. I do not know to what extent I shall be compelled to compromise. If I could get my church to be all I hope and dream for it, it would be quite different from the one it is now. There is some tainted money in it, and with it my salary is paid. Whither shall I go from *its* presence? I don't want to be classed with those well-meaning persons who arouse all the sleeping devils in mankind by my calm assumption that I was born to put the world right. But, on the other hand, to paraphrase Channing Pollock, I must plant myself indomitably in my instincts, and there abide. If brickbats fly about my head as they did about Emerson's in his theological controversy, I must say with him: "I shall go on just as before, seeing whatever I can, and telling what I see". There is such a thing as a redemptive quality in a personality in the midst of evil. It was an expressive word which Leigh Hunt used of Napoleon in his later days: "No great principle stood by him!" Great principles, born of great moments, fed and exercised by life's experiences, hardened by combat, stand there embattled by the onset of the foe. A man with convictions, said John Stuart Mill, is worth ten men with only opinions. The man of principles is more than himself. There is always something behind him, and it is this "something behind him" which has in it a redemptive quality.

Two fresh approaches to the idea of the Kingdom of God as being one of the tools which must be used in our teaching ministry linger in my mind.

The first comes from the writings of Clutton-Brock, at least fifteen years ago, in his little book *The Kingdom of God*. In the opening pages the author imagines a man from some far-off planet suddenly being dropped upon this swinging orb. He has never heard of the Bible until one day a New Testament is placed in his hand. He reads the Gospels, and discovers that a man by the name of Jesus was a great teacher, and the theme of his teaching had been "The Kingdom of God". A little later he is told that there is an institution called the Church which purports to propagate what Jesus taught. He goes into the Church and later studies its history. To his surprise he discovers that down through its history the Church has made many pronouncements. It held many Councils and argued many questions. It formulated many creeds and set forth many doctrines. It talked about hell as a place of punishment, or heaven as a place of reward. Many things the Church has struggled for, but in not one Council, in not one creed-making assembly, did it ever

say a word about the Kingdom of Heaven. It has spoken much about getting men to heaven, but nothing about getting them into the Kingdom of Heaven.

The other man who rang the changes on the necessity of laying first emphasis upon the Kingdom of God was William Burnet Wright, in *Master and Men,* being "a dissertation on the Sermon on the Mount practised on the plain". He wrote it in 1894, forty-three years ago, twenty-two years before Rauschenbusch wrote *The Social Principles of Jesus.* Said Wright:

> The Gospels are the last steps of the inspired revelation. Everything else in the New Testament is to be interpreted by them. The Epistles are not the authorized commentaries on the Gospels. The Gospels are the authorized commentaries on the Epistles. The Epistles do not supplement the Gospels. The Gospels supplement the Epistles. If there is anything in *Romans* which we cannot reconcile with *John,* it is not *Romans* by which we must try to interpret *John,* but *John* is the key to *Romans.* If we cannot harmonize the two, then, to be sure, it is *Romans,* not *John,* we have misunderstood, and therefore must not be swift to preach.
>
> If this principle had been strictly observed, there would have been no religious wars, no persecutions, no inquisition, in Christendom. There would have arisen no Roman Church, no Greek Church, no Protestant Churches. For there has been no religious war, no religious schism, which did not come from quarrelling over some debatable inference from the Epistles, and which was not in direct disobedience of some precept plainly stated in the Sermon on the Mount. If one-fourth of the energy which has been expended in trying to make men assent to human deductions from Paul's Epistles had been steadily exerted in pressing the Sermon on the Mount upon the conscience of mankind, it may be questioned whether there would be to-day an unbelieving person within, or a pagan nation without, the bounds of Christendom.

Without any qualifying statement whatever, I assert that religion is fundamentally and basically ethical. It has to do with human conduct, conduct that has its roots in the God of all the earth who must ultimately do right. For two reasons: first of all, it was Jesus who said, "By their fruits ye shall know them", and, secondly, always running through His teachings there was that insistence that a man could know God only as he loved his fellowmen. England has a great premier by the name of Stanley Baldwin. Not everyone will agree with all he says and does, but no one can deny the something in his personality which made him say several years ago:

> There lies in a little country churchyard not a dozen miles from where I live the body of one John Baldwin, described as being "of the forge" in the reign of Charles II.

> From that time various members of my family have engaged in nearly every branch of the iron trade. From that day to this, sometimes enjoying prosperity, sometimes having to struggle hard, my family has been connected with the great trade and I have some right to talk of hard times.
>
> When I took office most of what I had was in that ancient industry. The shares I hold now and which I held then could have been sold then for £3 each; to-day they are worth 20 pennies; There is no cataclysm on earth that can bring them back to more than a fraction of their former value.
>
> It may have been bad business on my part—many modern business men would say it was—I ought to have sold at the top of the market. But when you have an old name in business against which nothing has ever been said; when you know the public has come into business on the strength of that name; it is an impossibility to throw your shares on the market when you know that in all human probability the loss will fall on them, not on you.

I don't know Baldwin's creed, but I do know that if our teaching ministry is going to change our social order it must begin at some such place where men will be compelled by their own conscience to do justice to their fellowmen even at the expense of financial loss to themselves. And when we bring it closer home, what other than right human relations lie back of our own scathing judgment upon unscrupulous politicians, hard-headed industrialists who pay the bills of churches and then go out to exploit their fellow creatures; upon unforgiveness, injustice, race prejudice, and a multitude of other attitudes which run counter to the proposals of Jesus? Always in the end we assert, "Except ye become as a little child, and except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees, ye cannot enter into the Kingdom of God".

The preacher in any church will be the true teacher when his imagination is fired, and his courage sustained, with three great ideas of the Kingdom of God. First of all, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself". We've accepted that for our children, but for ourselves we give a pitiful exhibition of it. We live in luxury and ease while multitudes starve. We fight like beasts of prey when personal interests clash. We make the world a place of bitter, hopeless, grinding hatreds.

Again, Jesus said to a fine, high-minded young man, "Go, sell that thou hast and give to the poor". Unless the desire for possessions is mastered and curbed by other interests, they will destroy the spirit which they ought to serve. The modern world cries "more", and "more", and "more". We have a mania for things. We think that if machines and men can only make enough, then men, each man, will have enough to satisfy him. Always our desires outstrip our making of things to satisfy them. When shall

we know how to master our possessions, and more than that, how to live together without devouring one another?

The third outstanding teaching of Jesus is expressed in the words, "I came that ye might have life and have it more abundantly". And yet men tried to bind Him down to stiff and harsh conventions. On a Sabbath day He found a crippled man whom He set out to heal. And people said, What sacrilege! How sinful! Of course it was impious to give him help to ease his sufferings. The only thing that men and beasts were to men in Jesus's day was property. How far beyond that have we gone? When are we going to teach and teach vigorously that life must be affirmed, that men must be themselves, that all men shall have a chance at life, and their personalities be filled with beauty and significance?

The Kingdom of God does not set up systems. It transcends systems, and because of its transcendent and eternal quality it will for ever remain a difficult and dangerous doctrine to teach. I venture to say that the preacher who starts along the line of teaching the elemental doctrines of the Kingdom of God will find himself in as hot water as by anything he can say in defence of Socialism or Communism, but he will also have the satisfaction of having his feet firmly on the ground where he can maintain his position against all comers.

III.

One more tool the preacher has in his hand: it is a thing which I can better illustrate than define. In Mr. Bernard Shaw's *The Showing-up of Blanco Posnet* there is a story of how a man discovered God through a call of service. Blanco was a horse-thief who had gone off from his township with a horse he had stolen. On the way he was stopped by a woman with a child who had croup. She begged him to take the child to the hospital. It meant going back to the town from which he had fled and there facing the penalty of death. But he did not hesitate. He had recognized that this claim on his chivalry was the call of God. Standing in the court afterwards he explained his philosophy:

> It was early days when He made the croup, I guess. It was the best He could think of then; but when it turned out wrong on His hands, He made you and me to fight the croup for Him. You bet He didn't make us for nothing; and He wouldn't have made us at all if He could have done His work without us. He'd never have made us to be rotten drunken blackguards like me. He made me because He had a job for me, and I had to come along and do it, hanging or no hanging. And I tell you it didn't feel rotten; it felt bully, just bully. Anyhow, I got the rotten feel off me for a minute of my life and I'll go through fire to get it off me again.

The problem is not to get people to acknowledge that they ought

to be good, but to show them a Power which will enable them to do the thing they know they ought to do. For, after all, the true record of Jesus is not what the New Testament makes of Him, but what He sets out to make of men. Somehow I crave for myself, and for all my brethren in the ministry, the possession of a spiritual tool which will produce an urge in the souls of men so great that they cannot help but do what they know they ought to do. What is there in our preacher-teacher ministry that can make men say,

> I had to come along and do it, hanging or no hanging . . . it felt bully, just bully. Anyhow I got the rotten feel off me for a minute of my life, and I'll go through fire to get it off me again?

For what else did Jesus come to do but to save men from the bondage of those habits and fears and lusts which keep them from rising into the life of worship with God and therefore from becoming themselves?

Taking into consideration the fact that our age is strangely astray, that it is peculiarly baffled and confused by reason of the changing emphasis upon war and peace, the turmoil of our minds as we try to think ourselves through the tangled web of our economic and industrial structure, the almost total absence of the rhapsody which comes from a lack of personal experience in God, my guess is that in most respects this is no different day than any day in the history of mankind. Religion in any age has been more latent than active, and, as Stevenson said of Burns, folk now as ever are not so much devoted to religion as haunted by it.

There is the medley of faiths, feelings, fears, hopes, and hauntings of the people who make up our congregations. They live in a machine age with whirring wheels about them, racing engines above them, hammers ringing in their ears, furnaces panting in their faces, stifling smoke from cities in their throats; amidst all this the human soul! What are we going to do about it?

I am convinced that if our teaching ministry is going to approximate to the teaching ministry of Jesus, it must be single and direct, always recognizing that in the long list there is no such thing as an *intelligentsia* to whom our teaching must minister as over against the humble soul of the washer-woman in our pews. It will take a good deal more sweat on the preacher's part to deal at once with the longing in the spirit of the professor and the scientist, along with the tired housewife, than it does to shape and fashion a perfect model of rhetoric, all neatly bound in a leather portfolio.

The tool we must handle is one which probes into the moral defects of men which make them deny God and the reality of moral virtues. Here, for example, are folks in our congregations who know little about the claim of God. I had a neighbour who was a regular church-goer. Nearly every Sunday morning I saw her on her way to or from church. One morning she told me of the sermon her rector

preached on loving one's neighbour. She met her rector at the door of the church and laughingly told him that the one person she heartily hated was her next-door neighbour. And she had no idea of changing her attitude. I wondered what might have happened had the preacher been able to make her see that the only way she could meet God was through a recognition of her moral obligation. It is that power in our teaching which brings it home to men that the sin is against God, and not only a wrong against our brother or ourselves.

Or it may be that the preacher meets a problem of faith. In one of our New York papers the following editorial appeared a few months ago:

> Last Friday in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine the last rites were held for Michael Pupin, the herdboy of Servia who became the world-famous American physicist. Recognized in his profession by his election to the presidency of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, he was more widely known and beloved as the "immigrant" who became the "inventor". As a scientist he found in his long distant studies "concrete physical evidence that God loves the soul of man" into which "the spirit of the Lord has planted liberty". It is an impressive sequence that to-day the son of a slave receives like attention on his way to the grave—who beholding the glory of the Lord found the same liberty and is "changed into the same image from glory to glory". "Gangway" is given to the soul of Richard B. Harrison by whose simple, reverent art the poignant incidents of the pilgrimage of life has been glorified even as the faith of Pupin was strengthened by science. Religion offers its requiem alike to both who have, each in his own faith and work, made mortal life a nobler calling.

If the preacher would excel in teaching to those two extremes, somewhere in his make-up there must be embodied the simplicity of the teaching method of Jesus. James Weldon Johnson's *God's Trombones* is a series of folk stories; folk songs which have ever made their way into the souls of the blacks of the South; and Dr. W. E. Hocking recently suggested that there might be "folk-sermons"—sermons that speak the language of the human soul.

Here too are the problems of the man and the woman relationship. A young girl in my church was in love with a Roman Catholic young man. Her parents were opposed to their marriage. She came and talked it out with me. Not only was that bothering her, but what should she do about the terrific sex urge which could not be legally satisfied for another two or three years when they could be married?

Here was another young woman of my parish who wants to be married, but no young man has loved her. Now a married man has crossed her pathway. The urge is great. He is full-blooded. She goes to church. Her family is highly respected. She is industrious and self-sacrificing in her home.

What an opportunity for teaching, not in the pulpit alone, but in private. But one thing we must know, that unless our public teaching bears the hallmarks of breadth and vision, sympathy and human understanding, these youths with their problems, some of which we preachers never faced, will run away from us and seek their guidance elsewhere, or worse still, stumble on in the dark until life has lost its meaning and the soul is dead to the highest compulsion of the moral law.

Our most effective teaching, then, may not be in the pulpit or in the class-room, but in our personal contacts. To speak to one and give him both an assurance and a challenge to high living is far more difficult than to speak to a crowded church. Whether an individual turns in the direction of despair or faces the light, will depend largely on the preacher. Abraham Lincoln was troubled about immortality, and turned one day for an answer to Beecher. Later he went to Murdoch, the actor. When asked who gave him light on the matter he replied: "Murdoch; Beecher was too sure".

In Hugh Walpole's *The Inquisitor* comes this conversation:

> "Don't get too religious minded".
>
> "Why—what do you mean?"
>
> "Religion drives out friendship, and as a matter of fact, I need a friend just this moment. I had the shock of my life once. I had a friend for five years—the best I ever had. Kind, humorous, intelligent, understanding, unselfish. Then this good man met God and became such friends with him that he was always talking to him. God is love, he said morning, noon, and night. We must love everybody all the time. He was so snobbish about his new splendid divine friendship that he soon came to love nobody. When I told him this one day he was deeply hurt and he never spoke to me again. I've missed him ever since and thought ill of religion".
>
> "I expect that it wasn't God he met, but his own glorified idea of himself".

EVANGELISM.

A SCHEME OF STUDY.

By the Rev. R. M. Roberts, B.A., B.D.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

Inasmuch as we all have a general idea of what the term "Evangelism" means, we will not attempt a definition here and now. Let us note:

1. A very large percentage of the population is outside organized religion altogether. Does this matter?
2. The abandonment of the Church by many who previously were associated with it. Even some members treat it casually. Why this lapsing and this casualness?
3. The growing scarcity of the "seed of the Church". In our English Sunday Schools it would probably be true to say that the majority of the children belong to non-professing parents. What is to be done about it?
4. The present state of the world, which at the same time is a world afflicted with many problems and one in which spiritual values seem to be at a discount. Can it be that life becomes a real muddle when the reality of God is denied?

II. THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. Terms.

The word "Evangelism" is not in the New Testament but some near relatives are.

(i) Evangel—translated in our English versions "gospel". In Greek this first meant the reward given to a bringer of good news and then the good news itself. This was the name given to the message proclaimed by Jesus. It was good news.

(ii) The verb "to evangelize" occurs frequently, especially in Paul's epistles (*e.g.*, *1 Cor.* 1^{17}). It means to announce the Gospel with a view to its acceptance by men.

(iii) The noun "evangelist" occurs three times: (a) *Acts* 21^{8}—Philip the evangelist—see *Acts* $8^{5, 25\text{-}40}$, (b) *Eph.* 4^{11}—referring probably to a class of missionary preachers in the Church; (c) *2 Tim.* 4^{5}—Timothy is exhorted to preach the Gospel to those outside the Church.

2. The Evangel at Work.

(*i*) *The Gospels.*

(*a*) Note the kind of ministry Jesus carried on. He went about from town to town and from village to village. He mixed freely

with men and women. He taught, He wrought, He lived in the sight of men. He made friends, He blessed little children, He healed sick folk—by all that He was, and said, and did He sought to bring men to see God anew through friendship with Himself.

(*b*) Early in His ministry He chose the Twelve. This step suggests that (a) He had learnt to concentrate; (b) He saw that within a community there was the best hope of His significance and message being caught; (c) the creation of a community was the most solid provision He could make for the future.

(*c*) He found time for individuals. See how His treatment varied with Peter, Zaccheus, Nicodemus, the woman of Samaria.

(*d*) He kept Himself equipped for His task. See *Luke* 4^{16}, and consider the place of prayer in His ministry.

(*ii*) *Acts.*

The Pentecost experience resulted in a new community (2^{41-47}, 4^{31-37}). The Spirit of God was in the world before this. The new fact was Jesus. It was His life, death, resurrection, and exaltation that made possible a deeper work of the Spirit (*John* 14^{26}). Pentecost meant new illumination. The members of the company gathered together in the upper chamber had their eyes opened to what God had done in Jesus. Everything was transfigured. A new one-ness was created. They had fellowship one with another on the deep level of the Spirit. God who had acted in Jesus was still acting. Through His Spirit He was present in the new community. Hence the community was creative of character and life (*Acts* 2^{47}). The life of every member was quickened. Barriers, individual and social, went down. Men and women became one in a one-ness that was saving.

This community was immediately an evangelizing community. Its life and energy overflowed to redeem and transform life outside. Note that the real evangelizing instrument was the community. When Peter spoke, it was the community finding expression through him. Those who later went further afield were extensions of the community ($8^{4, 14, 26}$, $9^{32, 38}$). In 11^{19-22} attention is called to the founding of another community in Antioch. Note, however, how this is related to the Jerusalem community, and how through Stephen and Barnabas the latter is also linked up with Paul.

(*iii*) *Paul.*

With him the Christian movement definitely began to spread westwards. Think how, in leaving Palestine to evangelize the Gentiles, Paul did that which His Lord had deliberately refrained from doing.

The life and work of Jesus were *germinal.* It was the seed that He had sown that we see germinating in the work of Paul. Wherever

the apostle went, the miracle he saw happening before his eyes was the creation of a new community (*Gal.* 3^{28}, *Eph.* 2^{14}, *Col.* 3^{11}).

Discussion.

(a) Could anyone be an Apostle Paul provided he were filled with the Spirit?

(b) Why did the Christian movement spread westwards and not eastwards?

3. The Evangel.

What was the good news that was proclaimed? This a big and rather difficult question to answer, especially within our limits. We must, however, make an attempt.

For the earliest Gospel see *1 Thess.*; *1 Cor.* 15^{1-8}; *Mark* 1^{14-15}. The later epistles of Paul and the *Gospel of John* show very clear signs of development in the message.

The following statement is made as indicating something of what the Gospel may be for us.

(*a*) In Jesus, God acted decisively to make Himself known (*John* $1^{14, 18}$, 3^{16}, 14^{9}). There can be no real good news except it be from and about God.

(*b*) In Jesus we find God revealed as the Father, whose loving purpose it is that all men should be reconciled to Him and so to each other as brethren (*Mt.* 6^{9-15}; *John* 1^{14}; *2 Cor.* 5^{18-20}).

(*c*) The revelation was in all that Jesus was, said, and did. Human personality has characteristic expressions—character, life, attitudes, values, purpose, end, judgments. In all this Jesus was one with God. Supremely the revelation is to be found in His death upon the Cross. This was a supreme and final act of self-giving on the part of one who had always been giving Himself. He could do no more on earth to quicken in men faith in God. In the light of His Cross, sin is seen as nowhere else (*John* 1^{18}, 14^{8-11}, 15^{13}).

(*d*) Because God loves He forgives. His love is holy love. While hating sin, He loves the sinner. Lest we should sentimentalize His love, let us note that to be reconciled to God is to be reconciled to God's character and purpose (*1 John* 1^{9}).

(*e*) The resurrection of Jesus vindicates His faith. It also vindicates the character of the universe as moral. If the Cross had been the last word upon Jesus, faith in a loving Father, who was also good, would have been impossible (*Luke* 23^{46}; *Acts* 2^{24}).

(*f*) Jesus lives and we are saved through entering into a personal relationship of faith and love with Him. In His friendship we are changed after His pattern. We come to share in His life, to partake of His character, to cherish His purpose and values, *i.e.*, salvation is a vital matter and involves all that is mentioned in (*c*) above (*Mt.* 5^{48}; *Gal.* 2^{20}).

(*g*) His friendship is made real to us in the friendship of His friends. It is noteworthy that He promised His presence to the gathered company of His friends. Salvation is not a private affair (*Mt.* 18^{20}, 28^{20}; *John* 14^{18}; *Acts* 1^{1-4}, 4^{23}). Within a Christian company is Christian salvation possible.

(*h*) In the community of His friends we have an earnest of the new society which it is God's purpose to create on earth. This is the "light of the world" and the "salt of the earth". In the extension of the Christian society, wherein the individual comes into his own and the life more abundant is really made possible, is the hope of the ends of the earth. This is the leaven in the dough which is to leaven the whole lump (*Mt.* 13^{33}, *Rev.* 11^{15}).

(*i*) There is a stern side to the teaching of Jesus. From our experience of life, we knew that He spoke the truth. God's government is real. Out of relationship with Him we cannot be. Father or Judge are the two alternatives before us; but His judgments are redemptive (*Mt.* 25^{28-30}; *Luke* 14^{24}, 19^{42}; *Gal.* 6^{7}).

Discussion.

(a) Consider the above statement.
(b) Was there a Gospel before Jesus died upon the Cross?
(c) Can our idea of salvation be selfish?
(d) What makes a man a Christian? Wherein is religion more than morality?

This ends our New Testament study of evangelism. The noteworthy fact is that a Gospel first proclaimed in Palestine has now spread through Asia Minor and Greece as far as Rome, and in its progress has broken down barriers of nation, class, and sex.

III. MODERN EVANGELISM.

1. Evangelism. Definition.

"Evangelism is the name given to the efforts to help all persons to understand God's great love, to acknowledge Him as Father, and to live with Him in happy loving fellowship and unstinted self-forgetting service."

Discussion.

(a) Is this a good definition?
(b) What is the objective of Evangelism?
(c) Is Evangelism liable to the charge of interference with the lives of others?
(d) If the Gospel be good news, why is there no greater acceptance of it?

2. Implications.

(*i*) *The character and purpose of God*—that all men are embraced within His loving purpose.

Discussion.

This is easily said, but do you really believe it? What, for instance, are your real feelings towards people of another nation or colour? And what about that difficult person whom you sometimes meet? As far as you are really concerned, is he not "pretty hopeless"?

(*ii*) *The Uniqueness of Christianity.*

Discussion.

(a) Why disturb the Hindu or the Mohammedan or the Buddhist? Do these walk in darkness or in a lesser light (*John* 1^{9})?
(b) What is the central matter in any religion?
(c) What is unique about Christianity?

(*iii*) *The capacity of every man to respond to the Gospel.*

Discussion.

(a) What has the book of Jonah to say on this matter?
(b) Is it possible for a man to lose this capacity (*Mt.* $25^{28\text{-}29}$)?

(*iv*) On our part Evangelism implies: (a) that we know whereof we speak; (b) that it is good news and, therefore, we must share it; (c) responsibility.

Discussion.

(a) Can we be urgent about this work? Supposing you do not agree that a man's eternal destiny is fixed at death, can you still retain the note of urgency? Supposing you do agree, you will of course be urgent but will your appeal be Christian?
(b) Is there a danger of urgency degenerating into impertinence?

3. Method.

(*i*) *The Evangelistic Campaign.*

Consider the method of this. Think of the advertising done, the booming of the evangelist, the prayer meetings held, the kind of address given, the stories told, the hymns sung, the pressure brought to bear, the results definitely aimed at, the use made throughout of suggestion and the creation of conditions wherein men become suggestible.

Discussion.

(a) Consider the kind of conversion that takes place. What does it really mean?
(b) Is it necessary that all should experience it?
(c) Is there still room for this campaign? Is it in any case a second-best method?
(d) What do its results always pre-suppose? What should follow after them?

(ii) The Evangelizing Community.

The Christian community is the new social order set amidst the "world" and opposed to it (*John* 15^{14-19}; *Eph.* 3^{17-19}, 4^{13}). Paul called it the fellowship of the Holy Spirit (*2 Cor.* 13^{14}; *Phil.* 2^{1}), *i.e.*, the fellowship of Christians with each other, created by the Holy Spirit (*Rom.* 5^{5}). Time and again he returns to this fellowship and its implications (*1 Cor.* 13; *Rom.* 12; *Gal.* 5^{22}; *Eph.* generally; *Phil.* 2^{1-5}).

(*a*) Man is by nature a social being. Apart from some society he cannot be thought of. The particular society which a man keeps, determines and supports the kind of man that he is. To be a Christian, therefore, implies of necessity membership in a Christian community. Think of your own religion. It probably came to you from two social circles working in harmony—your home and your church; it certainly came from one of them. Think again what would happen to you were you to forsake all religious contacts. See *Acts* 2^{47}, 4^{23}; *Eph.* 3^{17-19}, 4^{13}. This community is in a special sense the sphere of divine grace and of supernatural life.

(*b*) Within it the Christian relationship is mutual. Being Christian means a Christian relationship with all men. But this can never be unless a man is in living contact with a society where the Christian relationship is not one-sided, but mutual and normal.

(*c*) Think of what such a community can mean in the quickening and sharpening of man's spiritual faculties. Salvation is not a thing of a moment, but a growing friendship with the Lord, whose presence is made real by the community, and a deepening understanding of His mind.

(*d*) In this community every member of it finds himself. By surrendering himself unreservedly, with barriers down, to the common life he realizes himself on the Christian level of life. Surrender to Christ involves surrender to the Christian community (*Mt.* 16^{25}).

Note that all this is not mere crowd psychology. The latter refers to a lowering process that really robs a man of his individuality and lets loose his powers on a low level. The Christian community means guidance, illumination, strength, encouragement, real education, companionship on the Christian level.

(*e*) This is the real Church of Jesus Christ—this company of people, sharing a common life, bound together by His Spirit. This reduces ritual and church government, and even some of our theology, to second place.

(*f*) To the world this society mediates the presence of Christ and witnesses to His Lordship. It is "the body of Christ"—the vehicle of His person in the world to-day. A community can be a better expression of Him than an individual can ever hope to be (*John* $13^{34, 35}$).

(*g*) Unless this community is in the world, there is no hope of evangelizing it. Evangelism really is the impact of the life of this community upon the life of the "world," and further, it is this community that provides that social life of friendship wherein the saving process can take place. We are strongly inclined, therefore, to urge the view that the Church, seen as this Christian society, is the key to the whole situation, and that our prime need to-day is the redemption of the Church.

Think of what all this implies for evangelism.

(*a*) Religion is socially conditioned and can only be transmitted and sustained by a community. Should not the normal issue for children brought up in the Church be Christian discipleship? And is this not the best method—to grow Christians? If we did this better, would there not be much less need for evangelism in the ordinary sense of the term?

(*b*) Possibly we have all been obsessed by the idea of mass-meetings. May be, too, that much energy has been frittered away on too wide a field. Jesus chose twelve. Supposing parents evangelized their children, and the Sunday School teacher his or her class?

(*c*) Carrying on the same suggestion: if you were keen on evangelistic work, would not this be a good way to proceed—to gather together a small group, establish a relationship of friendship and within this, as a friend, share your good news? "Where two or three are gathered together" in this way the whole is very apt to be greater than the sum of its parts.

(*d*) Group evangelism is possible and is worth experimenting with. Jesus sent out the twelve. The Group Movement sends out a team, *i.e.*, transplants a new society into a given area. One group can fertilize another. The cumulative witness from different angles can be very effective, and within a group barriers come down more easily.

(*e*) Even personal evangelism derives new colour from the group idea. The evangelist is an expression of his group, and through him those whom he seeks to evangelize may be introduced into a new community, wherein the real saving work will be done.

All that has been said above seems to point to the absolute necessity of the Christian community for evangelism.

Discussion.

(a) Is real fellowship lacking in the Church to-day? If so, what can we do to reproduce it? See *Acts* $1^{12\text{-}14}$.

(b) Is the ordinary Church too big and varied for fellowship? If so, how would you solve the difficulty?

(c) Is it possible for people of different religious views and different ages to have fellowship together?

(d) How does what has been said above bear upon "coming to chapel"?
(e) How does it bear also upon Sunday observance?
(f) Could you become the mouthpiece of the community? If not, can you urge any reason which is not rooted in self?
(g) Do you agree that the Christian community is the key to the whole situation? If so, should our efforts at the present time be directed mainly towards the redemption of the Church as the Christian community?

IV. TECHNIQUE OF EVANGELISM.

(*i*) *Friendship.*

Establish contact first of all. Do not rush to ask personal questions of a stranger.

(*ii*) *Sharing.*

(*a*) Speak not from a pedestal, but as a brother. No posing, no superior airs. It is possible for an "evangelist" to deceive himself and to want his own way and impose his faith upon another. (*b*) Witness, *i.e.*, speak what you know to be true and no more. Tell what Jesus means to you and, if it be necessary to another's salvation, you may tell what He has saved you from.

(*iii*) *Respect for Personality.*

Guard against the impatience that cannot wait, but would force matters. Remember the patience of Jesus with the Twelve. Undue pressure is undesirable. At the same time there is need of alertness to opportunity.

(*iv*) *Understanding Sympathy.*

Understanding (a) of man's need; (b) of his mind and its ways; (c) of the obstacles that hinder faith; (d) of the Gospel. Intellectual obstacles may be pushed to the front, but the real ones are probably moral. The evangelist needs to discern this and to realize that often the real obstacles are kept in the background. Let him persevere in friendship. Above all, he needs an understanding heart that feels something of the compassion of Jesus (*Mt.* $9^{36\text{-}38}$).

(*v*) *A Sense of the Holy Spirit's work in man.*

When a man turns his back upon us, it does not of necessity mean that he is turning his back at the same time upon God and truth. When the rich young man went away from Him, Jesus knew that the Spirit of God went with him. There is always Another at the work.

The above refers more immediately to personal evangelism, but behind it is the idea of personal evangelism as springing from the community.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE NEW FACTORY ACT.

By R. Brightman, M.A., F.I.C.

The celebration in 1933 of the centenary of the first Factory Act brought home to many, with something of a shock, the way in which this country had fallen sadly behind other countries during the last twenty years in its minimum standards in regard to the well-being of its factory workers. Our factory inspectorate has gained the admiration of the world and has served as a model which most countries have followed, and during the nineteenth century, broadly speaking, Great Britain undoubtedly led the world in imposing limitations on hours of working and the observance of minimum standards of safety and health in factories and workshops. It is all the more humiliating therefore to find that several industrial nations in Europe and America have now surpassed us in the solicitude they show towards their workers. In assessing the contribution of the Act recently placed on the statute book regard must therefore be had to the extent to which it rectifies the relatively backward condition into which our Labour code has fallen during the past two or three decades in regard alike to economic possibilities, scientific knowledge, and the achievements of other countries. Indeed, an important factor assisting to smooth the passage of the new Act through the House of Commons was the revelation in last year's Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops of the atrociously long hours which are being worked in some of the newer industries.

This position is the more distressing in view of the admirable example already set by many firms in this country, both large and small, in regard to the prevention of accidents, the improvement of operating conditions, and the introduction of the 5 day or 40 hour week. Since the first studies of the Health of Munition Workers Committee on hours of work and efficiency much research has been devoted to these matters by the more progressive firms as well as by the Industrial Health Research Board and the National Institute of Industrial Psychology, and its results are being applied in many quarters to an ever increasing extent.

The growth of scientific knowledge of such matters has probably contributed to the significant changes in the general attitude to hours of work and wages which have characterized the last few years of the depression. As Mr. H. B. Butler pointed out in the latest of the admirable surveys of the international situation which mark his Annual Director's Report on the International Labour Office, the problem of leisure was accentuated and not retarded by the slump. The tendency has been towards shortening the working week and not

lengthening it as in previous slumps. The problem of leisure, whether from the point of view of holidays with pay or education, forms part of a general demand for a better and wider life which is the present trend of social progress.

Much the same is true in respect of wages. The depression has led to increasing recognition of the value of the minimum wage; the dogma that the most effective way of combatting depression lies in the reduction of wages has largely been refuted. Part indeed of the opposition of the British Government representatives at Geneva to the 40 hour week proposal was based on the opinion that it would involve a reduction in wages, and incomes not wage rates are the foundation of standards of living. None the less, the part which the representatives of the Government and employers of this country have played at Geneva during the post-war years in relation to such matters as the ratification of the Washing Hours Convention, the hours of work of seamen, *etc.*, is not one which any concerned with the improvement of social conditions can regard with any pride or complacency.

Some definite improvement in our factory legislation is of course represented by the Act which has just been passed. But while Acts of Parliament are invaluable for establishing effective minimum standards and for rounding up laggards, they have their limitations as methods for promoting reform. It is impracticable to enforce by law at any given time standards substantially higher than those which the majority of firms adopt or are ready to adopt. The spread of more enlightened methods must to a large extent precede the prohibition of those considered unsatisfactory. The recently issued report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, however, not only brings home to us the limitations of legal enactment but indicates how very far even the low minimum standards prescribed under the old Act are from being observed, despite the example shown and the high standard adopted by more progressive and enlightened industrial units. The improvements which the new Act may effect in working conditions will in fact depend largely on its administration, and owing to the wide powers given to the Secretary of State in limiting, extending or modifying its provisions incessant vigilance will be demanded to ensure that the intentions of the Act are implemented.

When the Chief Inspector of Factories can write, with regard to the working of unfenced machinery, that

> too often immediate production is the main if not the only consideration, with the result that the question of safeguarding is left to the last and machines are put into use before proper fencing has been provided,

something is seriously wrong with factory management. There can be no question that Mr. Wilson is right in insisting that the safety of the worker should receive the first and not the last attention, and

that no machinery should be put into use until it is as safe as it is eventually intended to be.

It is true that the incidence of accidents—especially fatal and serious accidents—appears to be decreasing slowly, but it should be remembered that in many firms, both large and small, a very considerable decrease in the accident rate has been achieved in recent years. If it were possible to allow accurately for such firms, it is at least doubtful whether there is any improvement at all in the position elsewhere, and there are factors disclosed in the Inspector's report, such as longer hours of work, greater speed of work, employment of more inexperienced young workers or unpractised older workers, which may well have led to actual deterioration. The reduction of accidents has been most remarkable in those factories where safety has been given a definite place in management, and the problem is largely one of securing in management everywhere the same responsibility and active oversight.

Accidents to adult workers, many of which could be avoided by ordinary care or forethought, are bad enough; the accidents to young workers, to which the Chief Inspector directs special attention, are far worse. An investigation over a considerable area of industry to apportion the responsibility for accidents to juvenile workers suggested that for nearly half the accidents the young worker was to blame, but in nearly a third the employer was mainly responsible; Mr. Wilson cites numerous examples where the special protection which should be accorded to younger workers of both sexes has been wanting, sometimes when its absence had previously been pointed out to the management.

The imposition of severe penalties, however justified and salutary, is in itself not enough. The only reasonable and practicable method is to work for the prevention of such accidents. Without endorsing the radical and uneconomic action taken in dealing with the earliest recorded juvenile industrial accident, about 1540, cited by Mr. Wilson from the Common Place Book of John Hooker relating to the City of Exeter, 1485-1590, we can at least appreciate the spirit which refused to put material considerations in front of health and safety:

> A younge childe . . . . . standing neere to the whele of a horse myll . . . . was by some myshap come wthin the swepe or compasse of the cogge whele and therewth was torne in peces and killed. And, upon inquisition taken, it was founde that the whele was the cause of the childes dethe, whereupon the myll was forthwth defaced and pulled downe.

The prevention of accidents to juveniles presents a number of problems of its own, and the education of the young worker in the risks attached to his or her work, no less than the training and supervision of such workers and their selection for the work on which they

are to be employed, requires much more detailed and careful study than they have often received. These are largely technical matters which cannot be discussed here, but the Chief Inspector's contention that each employer should be educated until he accepts care for the safety of the boys and girls in his charge as a recognized responsibility is a matter of general concern. Though professional associations might do much to inculcate a higher sense of responsibility in this matter on the part of their members holding managerial or administrative positions in industry, only when there is a much more tender social conscience generally will any accident to a juvenile worker be regarded as a serious slur on the reputation of a firm and its management.

The need for such a social conscience is the more emphasized by the position in regard to hours of work. Although the 47 or 48 hour week is the normal week, many cases are reported where the working week exceeds 48 hours, not only for busy periods but often continuously for months at a time or even for most of the year. Work up to 50 and even 60 hours a week has been common in laundries, and in the metal trades in the Midlands, as well as in leather, bakelite and other industries and the woollen and worsted trades. Many cases of serious illegal employment are reported in bakeries, dry-cleaning works, garages, laundries, and depots for developing amateurs' films. Some of these are highly scandalous, such as the employment of boys of fourteen to seventeen for as many as 80 hours a week, of girls of fourteen up to 14 to 15 hours a day, and of women for an unbroken twenty days work. The Home Secretary himself in the first debate on the new Bill gave examples of 150, 200, and even 300 hours of overtime being worked in the year.

Much stricter limits on working hours for women and young persons have been imposed by the new Act. For young persons under 16 the weekly hours to be worked must not exceed 44 unless the industry can show that it would be seriously prejudiced if deprived of the labour of such workers for the additional hours, that the additional hours would not be prejudicial to their health, and that their occupation is likely to lead to permanent employment. With these exceptions the normal weekly limit for women and young persons is now 48 hours instead of 60 and the daily limit 9 hours instead of $10\frac{1}{2}$. Overtime is permitted for those over 16 up to 100 hours in a calendar year and for women only up to 150 in industries liable to seasonal and other pressure.

It is clear enough that if the new standards are to effect any real improvement and if their observance is to be secured they will require the active support of a strong public opinion. Some of the worst cases occur in industries peculiarly sensitive to public demand. A slightly more reasonable attitude on the part of the public, for example, in regard to the development of films, the return of laundry

work, and the like, particularly in holiday resorts, would greatly assist those firms which endeavour to observe the legal requirements and should check the undercutting by the unscrupulous employer which makes their position so difficult. If there is any real social conscience in the community, whether in the Churches or not, such abuses have surely only to be made known for public opinion to demand their abolition and redress.

This is not all. The penalties at present inflicted for some of the bad cases of overwork already mentioned are ridiculously inadequate: they make the offence a paying proposition, and they are certainly no deterrent in the case of unscrupulous employers. Evidently the pressure of public opinion is required on the magisterial bench no less than in factory management, and a Government which professes so great an enthusiasm for physical fitness and health might do well to convey a strong hint to the offending quarters that leniency is as ill-timed as it is reprehensible.

The new Factory Act should not therefore encourage any excessive optimism in this matter of industrial health and safety. The toll which is taken of life and happiness by accidents largely preventable is far too high for any satisfaction. Even under the new Act our standards fall short of enlightened practice in other countries and of those which should be set in view of our scientific knowledge to-day, whether in the field of management, industrial health, industrial psychology, protective clothing, lighting, air conditioning, and ventilation and technical control generally. What is needed is the creation of an informed public opinion, fully aware of the possibilities, unceasing in its vigilance, and resolutely determined to eliminate the abuse of health and safety at present far too common in our industrial system, and not least to see that overtime is kept within the limits of reasonable emergency and due proportion in view of the mass of unemployment which still persists throughout the land. If, alas, in the nineteenth century some of the leading opposition to factory legislation came from leaders of the Church, surely we are entitled to expect to-day that the Church's awakening concern with social reform will stir Christians to lead the way in rousing a public opinion resolved to end such social injustices and evils and to ensure that the knowledge and resources now at our disposal are fully utilized to secure safe and healthy conditions everywhere in industry.

DISCOVERING THE FATHER.

By the Rev. Norman Goodall, M.A.

The essence of personal religion is to be found in our individual consciousness of God. In the nature of things this personal God-consciousness takes different forms, for just as in every human being there are qualities which differentiate each personality from others, so the form which our individual experience of God may take will have its distinctive features in every life. But while remembering the infinite varieties of religious experience, we can enumerate certain common roads which in all ages have been the highway of God to the heart. He has been discerned in the sense of awe which breaks upon our hearts as we become conscious of the mystery and wonder of things. He has been felt in the dictates of conscience—dictates varying in their degree of moral enlightenment according to time and place, but always carrying with them that "categorical imperative", the sense of "must" in relation to moral values. Or He has been found immanent in the world of His creation. Nature has been recognized as the garment of God and the spirit of man as the candle of the Lord. In recognition of these marks of His presence the heart has been constrained to worship and has been enabled to say "I know!"; "I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee". All these and innumerable other forms of God-consciousness have entered into the Christian experience of God, yet none of them is distinctively Christian. They are forms of experience which can be illustrated from the *Old Testament* as well as the *New*, from the sacred writings of other religions and from the writings of the mystics, non-Christian as well as Christian. The most distinctive and central thing in the Christian experience of God is to be found in the discovery of the Father; in the consciousness of a presence which not only impels our homage but evokes our love; which not only makes us bow before the ineffable and unknown but which makes us rejoice before the friendly and the known. It is an experience which does more than lay upon us the categorical imperative of duty; it liberates our powers in the glad consciousness that such duty is the good will of the Father, meant to be not a burden but a delight. Such an experience of God does more than stir us to a sense of the tremendousness of life and destiny; it awakens us to a consciousness of our sonship and enables us to live in the liberty of children for whom there is playtime as well as duty, laughter and singing as well as the discipline essential to the achievement of manhood.

There is some danger at the present time of shifting the emphasis in the interpretation of religion from this most distinctive mark of

Christian experience. The theologians may be read less widely than preachers sometimes assume, but prevailing emphases in theology affect, if only half-consciously, the prevailing tone of religion; and at the moment we are in a wave of theological thought which is overstressing not merely the non-rational but the more austere and sombre elements in man's consciousness of God. From their different standpoints Otto and Barth have brought what was probably a needful corrective to a too facile interpretation of the divine Fatherhood, and their summons may well rectify an attitude in worship which lacks a sufficient sense of awe. But the last word in the Christian interpretation of God does not lie either in Otto's re-emphasis of the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans,* or in Barth's recrudescence of a Calvinistic doctrine of the divine majesty. To take from such teachers as these the dominant note of our religion will take us far from the intention of Jesus, which was to allay men's fears concerning the divine mysteries, remove shadows from the face of God, and make men at home with the Father. It is true that even in the full light of the Christian revelation there is that in the ultimate nature of the Godhead which must remain for us a mystery. God dwelleth in light unapproachable whom no man hath seen or can see. But the mystery is the mystery of light, not of darkness. Though we may be confronted with the inexplicable we can trust the divine assurance: "Fear not . . . It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom . . . Be not anxious . . . Your Heavenly Father knoweth . . . " And in the most searching of all experiences—those which plumb the depths of the heart and resolve the mystery of our iniquity—the truth as it is in Jesus is best seen in the picture of the Father watching for the prodigal's return.

Along what roads may we best hope to attain to this personal discovery of the Father? The one sure starting point is, of course, the testimony of Jesus Christ. It is true that the experience we are seeking is an experience that shall be our own, and not even Christ's confidence in the Fatherhood can be for us what we need if it fails to touch any responsive chord in our own experience. But the supreme discovery becomes ours not by any turning in upon ourselves but by exploring life under the guidance of a light which has its origin beyond ourselves. And that light finds its supreme focusing point in the crucial fact of history—Jesus Christ. Taking, then, this light as our guide, one of the first steps to the personal discovery of the Father is the ordering of our lives upon the confident assumption that this universe is the Father's house and therefore our home. We shall still be conscious of the mystery of things. There will be much of which we stand in awe. But there will be very little of which we are afraid, in any sense of terror or dread. We shall recognize that we are in a universe of which we are in a great sense masters because we are our Father's sons. In a characteristic

passage William Law tells us that when he looked out of his eastern window every morning at day-break he saw Almighty God creating His shining sun anew and sending him into the sky in order to lighten William Law to another day of duty and devotion. There is a splendid impudence about this attitude, but there is something essentially Christian in it, too. Luther was revelling in the same kind of experience when he wrote:

> If I thoroughly appreciated these first words of the Lord's prayer—"Our Father which art in heaven"—and really believed that God, who made heaven and earth and all creatures and has all things in His hand, was my Father, then should I certainly conclude with myself that I also am a Lord of heaven and earth, that Christ is my brother, Gabriel my servant, Raphael my coachman, and all the angels my attendants at need, given unto me by my Heavenly Father.

Yes, the universe with all its mystery is the home of the children of God. Sun, moon, and stars, the ineffable grandeur of land and sea, rightly evoke our awe, but such awe is the wonder of love, not the cringing attitude of the terror-stricken. These things are ours by right of Sonship, and the more we learn to apprehend them in terms of Jesus Christ the more do we discern in them all the presence that casts out fear.

> Thy voice is on the rolling air.
> I hear Thee where the waters run.
> Thou standest in the rising sun
> And in the setting Thou art fair.

An equally sure—some would say a more sure—road to this personal discovery of the Father is to be found in the way of obedience to the moral precepts of Christ and to the dictates of a conscience illumined by His words. Spiritual experience and moral obedience are inextricably intertwined. Obedience—as it has been rightly said—is an organ of insight. "If any man will do His will he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God . . . If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." Consciousness of the Father is not always or primarily an ecstasy incommunicable to others. Clear insight into the way of obedience and the quiet consciousness of duty done, the sense of harmony with a purpose that has laid its vivid imperatives upon our lives, or the satisfaction which comes of being engaged in an enterprise so morally invigorating as the Christian adventure—all these are elements in an authentic experience of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. I believe there are many people, less mystically (I use the word in a non-technical sense) inclined than others, yet with a keen sensitiveness to the Christian moral ideal and a ready obedience to its implications for their lives, who would hesitate to claim that they have been the

subject of "religious experiences", but who are nevertheless living in intimate fellowship with the Father. One of the characters in Charles Morgan's *The Fountain* makes a nice discrimination between two types of music-lovers—those who take their music drunk and those who take it sober. The distinction is elaborated more philosophically as one between those in whom thought is an attribute of feeling and those in whom feeling is an attribute of thought. In either case there may be perfect insight into the significance of music and an equally valid and fruitful experience of its power. It is doubtful, for example, if Bach ever wrote his music drunk. Even when he soars to dazzling heights and penetrates to profoundest depths there is an almost unvarying mathematical precision and a severely intellectual element in the structure of his work. Yet none would doubt that Bach has sure access to the mysteries of harmony and that he became a channel of revelation for that "language one need fathom not but only hear and feel". The analogy is applicable to our quest for a valid experience of God. There are chords in the hearts of some of His children which vibrate more responsively to the mystical element in religion. There are others equally quick to respond to the summons for practical obedience. Both alike are subject to the impact of God upon their souls. By both experiences is the Father known. And if the experience of those "who take their music sober" sometimes needs the enrichment and fermentation that come in a vision which begets wonder, there is no doubt that the personal religion of the more "God-intoxicated" falls short of true fellowship with the Father if it has not taught them to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God.

But the culminating step in this process of personal discovery lies in what I would call a great experiment in dependence. If the Christian affirmation be true that God is best known in an experience of His Fatherhood, this presupposes a need and capacity on our part to test His love in a submissive act of sonship. It is difficult to express this in terms that are not open to misinterpretation; it is also difficult to avoid giving the impression that this involves an experience which is only possible to the more mystically minded. There is, further, a certain resistance to be overcome in the minds of those who feel that anything in the nature of personal "surrender" assails the independence of the soul. When personality is functioning at its healthiest level manhood is conscious of a great reluctance to yield the keys of its inner citadel. Even when pressed by needs and difficulties which strain our self-sufficiency to breaking point, we imagine there is something unmanly in admitting even to God that we must yield to a strength greater than our own. As Morrison puts it in Conrad's *Victory*: "I believe in children praying—well, women, too, but I rather think God expects men to be more self-reliant." This, I imagine, lies at the basis of all forms of Stoicism and I believe

there is much in it that is compatible with a full Christian experience. It was not the way of Christ to undermine men's self-respect but to restore it where it had been lost and to give a more enduring basis to it where it was present. Yet that more enduring basis was only given by awakening men to the fact that human nature never has been and never will be merely self-sufficient. Personality is not a self-contained entity. It is in process of reaching a maturity which is only to be attained in fellowship with God. Whether we like it or not there is no final independence for the soul of man. The very greatness of its destiny, and that which gives it true dignity, is the fact that its real life is rooted and grounded in the life of God. This is not to deny our rights or to weaken our responsibilities in the achievement of manhood. It is to point out the only way along which that achievement may be ours. The recognition of this makes all the difference between a Stoicism which at best can summon man to pit his lonely little heroisms against a universe which is unknowable or unfriendly, and a faith which calls man to the fullness of life that is his in reliance upon a Father who can be both known and loved. The precise road along which we reach this discovery of our dependence varies with individual circumstances and needs, but every such road has its most significant turning point when it leads us to a great committal of the inner springs of our being to a power which proves to be self-authenticating. That such a turning point involves the bending of our pride is the most invariable element in the experience, and the sense of surrender is all the greater when the turning point has been reached in a fruitless endeavour to resolve the moral conflict in terms of our self-sufficiency. But that such an experience involves the abandonment of any of the prerogatives of manhood is denied by the witness of all who have passed through it. It is, indeed, the realization of our true manhood by accepting the privileges of our sonship. For personality is capable of attaining to no nobler expression of manhood than that which is seen in the glorious liberty of children of God.

JESUS AND THE WEATHER.

By the Rev. Fred Smith.

When it is remembered that there are in the world to-day something like 505 millions of people professing to be the followers of Jesus, and when it is recalled what Jesus said about the weather, it becomes evident to thinking minds that the topic mentioned in the title is of far wider importance than to be casually relegated to alcoved meetings of Christian people such as prayer meetings and adult Bible classes. It might even merit consideration in the wider appeal that comes through publication in some periodical whose interest is for those who live along the arterial highway of life itself. That is why the present writer has brought this topic out into the open.

He lives somewhere near what has been called by the descriptive Mencken "the Bible Belt" of the United States of God's own country. More specifically it might be said to be near the buckle of the belt, or rather near the buckled-in part of the belt; the area that, in another aspect, is said to be the dust bowl of the Middle West. Of late the weather has been putting on a circus or whatever it is that puts on fifty-seven varieties of itself. Cyclones to the south of us; dust storms to the west of us; floods all around us have done "their darnedest". Pardon the language, but one must go native at times to express what one hears about the weather in the buckled-in section of the Bible Belt. Scriptural!! Not much, when one gets to talking about the weather. And, once upon a time, Jesus talked about the weather. The way that He talked about it, however, was not as many of His followers are talking about it just at present. Let us see what He said.

Quantitatively considered, it was not much. This, of course, may be due to the omissions of His reporters. Yet they have captured a few things for us. Qualitatively speaking, what we have from Jesus concerning the weather is *multum in parvo*. Altogether to His credit, or perhaps to the credit of His reporters, though we incline to the first surmise, is the fact of the way that Jesus talked about the weather. This is more than can be said of many of His followers. According to the records there is one very interesting story told that should not be overlooked—that of the storm-filled day when He sailed across the lake with His disciples. The swiftness and strength of the local storm got the best of the disciples in the boat. Jesus Himself was having a sleep. The panic-stricken disciples awoke Him. The weather had got the best of them. Jesus (so the story goes) took the weather in hand, and "there was a great calm".

I mention this because in this Bible-belted area, even to the regions beyond, there have been not a few followers of the storm-

stilling Jesus who seem to have wished that He was around to help them in their distress. They have held prayer meetings petitioning God, in the name of Jesus, to give them rain in time of drought. Now that I remember it, I recall that some such form of prayer has been actually printed in the Book of Common Prayer. I have looked it up. I quote the relevant portion of it:

> Almighty and most merciful Father, we humbly beseech thee, of thy great goodness, to restrain these immoderate rains, wherewith, for our sins, thou hast afflicted us.

Somehow, to me, this does not sound like Jesus. He talked about the weather, the immoderate rains and all that, in another strain to this. Personally I prefer Jesus. Let us see why.

Before doing so it may be well to notice that Jesus did not make a practice of going around stilling local tempests. He had other things to do than that of being a rain-maker or rain-stopper to order. He had other things to do than to be the weather manager of Galilee in the interest of panicky or parched people, as the case may be. It is a pity that these rain-petitioning people cannot get the same idea with regard to God. God should be something more than a metamorphosed Mother Hubbard.

There is another story that merits mention. On the day that Jesus was done to death, so the story goes, the weather played its part as if in very wrath at the foulness of the deed that was being done. The weather sometimes seems to work that way. It was so when Oliver Cromwell died. A storm tore roofs from houses. Huge trees were levelled in every forest. It seemed like a judgment of God. It seemed as if the weather had a conscience of its own. Weather-wise? Perhaps so. The prophets, with their far-flung imaginations, were accustomed to say and think that the climatic epochs in history would always be accompanied symphonically with the powers of the weather. Jesus seems to have been under this idea somewhat at one time, according to the "Little Apocalypse". In the light of what Jesus said with regard to the weather in general, His reference to a particular sort of weather here may be taken as having the virtue of a coincidence rather than that of an operating conscience. Many good men have died on days filled with sunshine. Dynasties have come to an end when all the world of nature was breathing peace. It is better to think that the weather, in these regards, is conscienceless rather than intermittently so. On the words of Jesus Himself in another connexion we might think so. We shall arrive at these in due course.

Just here we might make mention of the way that Jesus gives an unconscious hint of His attitude to a scientific approach to the weather. Meteorology in Palestine in the days of Jesus was in a naïve state of innocence. Yet some observations indicated the working logic of the scientific mind. The people had their own interpretations of weather sequence subsequent to certain acknowledged colour effects in the

sky. Jesus made a preaching point of that. But Jesus was weather-wise in a profounder sense. His wisdom went beyond that of observing "the signs of the sky" for the realizing of predictive forecasting. He had looked into the matter of the weather for its revealing of the ultimate philosophy concerning the running of the universe. The weather showed God at His divinest; not at His "darnedest".

And now we are at the pith of what Jesus thought about the weather. He gave it one day when He said that God "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust". That is to say that God has a way of His own in handing out the weather, and that way is a commendably moral one. This is brought out by noticing that Jesus was just at this time talking about the highest moral life. He was seeking to introduce the principle of equality into one's social life and relations. Evidently the most apposite illustration He could think of was God's way with the weather. Understand that and the way of the highest life is revealed.

That is to say, to Jesus the weather did not merely just happen. The weather was to Jesus more than "a fortuitous concourse of atoms". Some modern poet in a familiar poem has traced back the pedigree of a loaf of bread. Back of the bread is the flour, and back of the flour is the sun and shower, and back of them all is God. Jesus talked like that about the weather. Back of it all was God. The weather, with all its seeming vagaries, was a directed business. It had no self-starter. It never went on a spree of its own. There was no weather to Jesus outside the will of God.

Furthermore, far from being a sort of immoral fact in life, or an "immoderacy" in nature, remembering our Prayer Book, it was the most revealingly moral fact that Jesus could think about. It was there, in noticing the seeming capriciousness of it, that Jesus saw the morality of it. Good and evil folk, just and unjust, got shares alike. He totalled up the weather in terms of the will of God. To think of it as the sum only of temperature was not enough for Him. Jesus simply could not work out a coherent philosophy of the universe in a conglomeration where the weather was left to its own devices. The only solution was to speak of it as the revealing of God's divineness. The reason why so many of the professing followers of this Thinker about the weather never get very far is that they think of it provincially instead of profoundly. They too often pray about it when they should be thinking about it. Jesus never asked to have the weather changed for His benefit. He was too interested in thinking about it in a cosmic sense to give time to speak about it complainingly. Perhaps He saw that the easiest, quickest way to make of this old weather-environed world a chaos would be to have the prayers of fair-weather petitioning saints, on the one hand, and of rain-

petitioning saints on the other, answered. Jesus surveyed the weather, not for profit's sake, but for philosophy's sake. He did not want to change the weather so much as to comprehend it. And the result was the conclusion we have mentioned.

As we would express it, it is very evident that the weather has no pets. It plays no favourites. But as Jesus phrases it, this impartiality of the weather is really a revealing of God Himself. In this area of life God is strictly impartial, or should we say, one hundred per cent democratic! He simply cannot afford to dole out the weather according to the moral goodness or otherwise of the recipients. It does not lend itself to that sort of use. If it did the world would toboggan to chaos on doubly-greased skis. The wage envelopes of the saints are never weather-filled. God uses another sort of currency for that sort of thing. It always seems to me a shallow sort of prayer that would interfere with the impartiality of God. If a change of weather is desirable it is well to remember that the way of it is not through praying on our knees. The way of it is shown in ten thousand devices in civilization. By frigidaire or furnace, according to our need, we can make our own weather within certain localized areas. As science grows from more to more, and more of research in us dwells, these areas are going to be enlarged until the limits of man's comfort are reached. Then, in a more comfortable environment than now (my room just now happens to have a temperature that must be in the nineties), we shall be able to discuss the ultimate philosophy revealed by the weather.

Happily Jesus did not wait for the age of the frigidaire and the furnace before He gave us that philosophic word. He was concerned with the philosophical values in the weather rather than with the practical manipulation of it. Others would supply the deficiency of which Mark Twain spoke when he said that "most people had lots to say about the weather but none seemed to be doing anything about it". They are now. But the attitude of Jesus to the weather was other than merely practical. It was definitely philosophical. And the pith of it was summed up in the sentence: "Equal treatment for all". God is the ultimate democrat.

So enthused was Jesus with this principle of equal treatment to all that He told the people of His day that He would like them to incorporate it into their social relationships. To do so would be to make them worthy to be called "sons of God". They would be as God Himself, dispensing goodwill as impartially as God dispenses the weather. They should spill their goodwill as God spills rain and sunshine.

In passing it is interesting to notice that the writers of the preamble to the Constitution of the United States seem to have caught a deep insight into this law of equality. They declared that all men were born free and equal, and by virtue of this fact were

entitled to certain inalienable rights. Justice, fair play, righteousness exist equally for all. So far as these rights are concerned—and others like them—they should be dispensed in the impartial way that God dispenses the weather.

And here the philosopher becomes the preacher. So far as that is concerned I have nothing to do with it here, except to say that the majority of professing Christians seem to have fallen far short of dispensing their goodwill in the manner that Jesus says God dispenses the weather. Evidently Jesus saw that to do that was as hard a task as it is a holy one. Well might He say that they would be called by the high title of "sons of God" in the achieving of it. It is high time the professing followers of Jesus gave more thought to the philosophical gold contained in the things Jesus mentioned about the weather.

TWO BOOKS FROM CHICAGO.

Dr. Hugh Vernon White's *A Theology for Christian Missions* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, $2) is worth reading in this day when the presuppositions of missionary enterprise are being everywhere re-examined. In the sense that Christ's Gospel was "anthropocentric", the Sabbath and other institutions being made, according to His teaching, for man, and not man for the institutions, Christian missions, says Dr. White, must be anthropocentric. (Who *did* invent that horrid hybrid *homo-centric*?) The one question the missionary has to ask is: what is good for these people to whom I am sent? This book convincingly argues that the missionary purpose can be stated best not in terms of creeds or particular cultural patterns but only in terms of the more abundant life.

Dr. Anton T. Boisen's *The Exploration of the Inner World, A Study of Mental Disorder and Religious Experience* (Willett, Clark, $2.50), almost certainly marks the beginning of a new period in the study of religious psychology, for it establishes the idea that the so-called functional types of mental disorder are not illnesses as such. They are rather comparable, in the pathology of the physical body, to the fever of the inflammation which overcomes, or is designed to overcome, illness. The cataclysmic religious experience is the fever through which the patient regains his health: mental disorder with religious concern as its content is a fever which fails to save the patient. Dr Boisen speaks with authority not only because he has for many years been a chaplain in a great State hospital for mental cases, but also because in his youth he actually had the experience of hovering between a rebirth of spiritual life and what the psychiatrists would have called, and did call, an abnormal mental upheaval.

DOUGLAS HORTON.

BRUCE WALLACE AND "BROTHERHOOD."

By W. R. Hughes, M.A.

In April, 1887, in the inconspicuous little town of Limavady in Northern Ireland, appeared the first number of a weekly publication, issued under the title of *Brotherhood* by a young minister named J. Bruce Wallace. Last year the final number of *Brotherhood* was published, also issued from Limavady and still under the editorship of Bruce Wallace. During the whole of this period of almost fifty years he had continued to send forth the magazine, from various centres and in various forms, often writing the bulk of it himself, in pages that reflected his own personality and faith. It is surely fitting therefore that some tribute should be paid to an achievement remarkable not only for courage and persistence but also for its deep and wide influence. A good many men, in the enthusiasm of youth, have produced magazines and propaganda sheets which have usually had a short life and an anxious one. But where can we find another example of a man who has kept steady to such an aim and effort for nearly half a century?

Bruce Wallace was trained in Belfast for the Presbyterian ministry but, finding it impossible to conform to the Westminster Confession, he transferred himself to Congregationalism, in whose service he has held pastorates in Dublin, Belfast, and London. He sought always the place where need was greatest and successfully avoided calls to comfortable or well-to-do districts. His own distinctive message always found a response, and he usually gathered round him an eager band of young people whom he had awakened to a realization of their Divine sonship and their consequent duty to live as brothers to all men. In a day when the Gospel message was still preached almost exclusively in terms of original sin and individual salvation, the young minister—often branded as heretic and disturber of society—was emphasizing the ideas of Divine immanence and the principles of Christian socialism. His influence was very widely spread, not only through the pages of *Brotherhood*, but also by his intensely earnest preaching and speaking, and it touched many who have taken a far more prominent place in the public eye than he did himself.

For more than a year the new magazine appeared as a penny weekly. Then it moved to Belfast and became a monthly. In party-coloured Belfast the social gospel of *Brotherhood* found it hard to obtain an unprejudiced hearing, and the editor was apt to be attacked from both fronts. He has been in the centre of some lively scenes on the Custom House steps and in other places in which he carried on a vigorous and persistent open-air ministry. For the written work

he found useful collaborators in the campaign for social justice; among them the most frequent contributors, at this stage, were E. D. Girdlestone, of Bristol, the Rev. John Fordyce, Thomas Adair, and Michael Fluerscheim, of Baden-Baden, the author of *Money Island* and other works on economics. Wallace also had close connexions with American social theorists and writers. He was one of the earliest sponsors of Henry George on this side of the Atlantic, and in 1889 Edward Bellamy's celebrated social romance *Looking Backward* was first printed for British readers—in serial form in the pages of *Brotherhood*. In the same year Bruce Wallace visited Canada, the United States, and Mexico in order to make a personal investigation of the various experiments in co-operative colonization which were being made. One of the most interesting features of *Brotherhood* during this period was the series of reports of his personal adventures among the idealistic enterprises in these far places. A reading of these articles to-day might still teach some of our social workers or dreamers many useful lessons.

In 1891 *Brotherhood*, with its editor, migrated to London, where, during the next year, he took over an almost derelict church in Southgate Road, and soon filled it with a new, and somewhat unorthodox, congregation, intent on doing as well as hearing. The church became very widely known as "Brotherhood Church", and as a rallying-place for youth and enthusiasm, where men could freely discuss what the minister preached, and join with him and others in experiments in practical Christianity. Some became members of the little colonies of Tolstoyan type that were started about this time. Others united with their leader in various linked schemes which were intended to form the nucleus of a future co-operative commonwealth.

This was in line with the distinctive social teaching of *Brotherhood*, which persisted, in various forms, through all its history. The plan proposed was that, without any direct attack on the conventional rights of property, without waiting for the conversion of a majority of the nation, without the need for Acts of Parliament, a voluntary co-operative social system should forthwith be founded in England. Any citizen who wished to do so should be given the opportunity of joining a scientifically organized system of mutual service and support. The provision of an alternative means of life in this way would leave no helpless victims to be exploited even by the most selfish capitalist. Moreover the standard of subsistence and comfort available within such an alternative "commonwealth" would automatically fix a decent minimum for those still employed by private enterprise.

Proposals of this type have continually been made, from the time of the earliest socialists onward, and are re-appearing to-day, for example, in a more modest form, in the work of the "Order of Friends" in the distressed areas. In one of the earlier Fabian tracts

the Webbs attacked Wallace's proposals as a reversion to "Utopianism". Nevertheless in 1895 and the following years a vigorous attempt was made to put theory into practice. The "Brotherhood Co-operative Trust" was registered and opened a store in North London; sympathizers were asked to enrol in the "Mutual Service Circle", in which barter notes were used as a medium of exchange; and a coal-mine at Swadlincote in Derbyshire was acquired and run as part of the general co-operative scheme. A certain amount of success was achieved, but legal difficulties soon arose and the payment of wages in barter notes was held to contravene the Truck Acts. Some of the affiliated societies carried on their work for a number of years, but in the end all of them were voluntarily wound up.

From Brotherhood Church Wallace moved to East London and soon became associated with the work of the Mansfield House University Settlement, of which he eventually became Warden, making a deep impression on the working men of the district by his Christian character and by the force of his teaching on religious and social themes.

Bruce Wallace was one of the earliest fellow-workers with Ebenezer Howard in the Garden City movement, and when the first Garden City was founded at Letchworth he determined to move there and help the enterprise in what ways he could. He established himself in a small cottage, where he lived alone in great simplicity, and soon became known as a spiritual leader. In response to a spontaneous demand a Sunday evening meeting was established in order to give him a regular platform, and later he undertook the training of a small resident group of young men who wished to prepare themselves for a co-operative social life based on Christian faith.

During all this period *Brotherhood* was appearing as a monthly magazine, reviewing political and social life, and calling for new applications of the teachings of Christ to meet the needs of a new day. Among the noteworthy group of contributors were J. C. Kenworthy (author of *The Anatomy of Misery* and projector of colonies), H. Thompson, R. S. Gilliard, of Bristol, and two women, Mary Everest Boole, widow of the famous mathematical Professor and herself a highly original thinker, and Miss S. A. Miller, at that time Principal of the Diocesan Training College, Oxford. Later came R. S. Whitwell and others, but the most faithful and regular helper was always Dr. W. Winslow Hall, of Bournemouth, who published serially not only sets of poems and essays on "Applied Religion", but also, more recently, valuable detailed studies of mystical and illuminative experience, as known and described by men and women of the past and of to-day.

In 1905 died Antony Canning Swinton, one of the founders of the Land Nationalization Society. In his will he left a sum of money

to found an "educational union on spiritual principles of life", naming E. N. Dennys's book, *The Alpha,* as the source of his inspiration for the plan and Bruce Wallace as the man most fitted to lead the proposed Union. From this bequest arose the "Alpha Union", which was founded in 1906, with *Brotherhood* as its literary organ. The work of the Union was carried on partly by means of local groups and a circulating library, and partly through central Summer Schools. These were held mostly at Letchworth in the building known as the Cloisters, lent for the purpose by Miss Annie Lawrence, but in certain years they were held in Wales and in Switzerland. Wallace secured for these Summer Schools a series of coadjutors, including R. J. Campbell, John Hunter, Annie Besant, Rhondda Williams, K. C. Anderson, and J. W. Graham, with, from America, Dr. A. S. Crapsie and J. Stitt Wilson, whose whirlwind Christian Socialist campaigns are still remembered in the North and who later became Socialist Mayor of Berkeley, California. Many people welcomed the opportunity of attending these schools because of their desire to come again under the spell of Wallace's personality and teaching. During the latter part of his residence in Letchworth Bruce Wallace lived in a house which had been built for him by his friends, and it was a Letchworth lady, Mary Tudor Pole, who became his wife.

During the war *Brotherhood* kept flying the flag of an absolute pacifism, and lost many subscribers thereby, as it had previously done during the Boer war. Its circulation was never very great, being usually about one thousand, though from time to time very large issues were printed for propaganda purposes.

The pages of the magazine reflected always the varied interests of its editor, and a good deal of space was devoted to such subjects as psychical research, spiritualism, Biblical criticism, comparative religion, the "New Theology", the American "New Thought" movement, the philosophy and politics of India, Land Nationalization and Town Planning, and social experiments of every kind in every land. There was always included a general commentary on current events, with an outlook on very much the same lines as that of the "Fellowship of Reconciliation" founded during the war.

Now Bruce Wallace has laid down his pen, and a great company of friends and admirers will wish to send their thanks and affectionate thoughts to the little farmhouse in Limavady where he lives with his wife and daughter. We who are of that company will ever keep in thankful memory his spare figure, his eager, loving face, his simplicity of living, his courteous self-giving. He taught us something of the glory of the Christian life and the meaning of loyalty to the Kingdom of God.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

By the Rev. A. M. Chirgwin, M.A.

The Editor has invited me to write something in response to his paragraph in the July issue dealing with the L.M.S.

He holds that the L.M.S. should set its house in order on the ground that the "present method of government and administration is obsolete and inefficient". "How", he asks,

> can a body of Directors some hundreds in number effectively control any Society? . . . What the Churches see, or think they see, is a cumbrous and inept system of government and administration and an unwillingness to experiment in regard to co-operation with the Congregational Union, most of all evident perhaps in regard to publication departments.

There are here two proposals—that the Board of Directors should be greatly reduced in number, and that the L.M.S. and the Congregational Union of England and Wales should be much more intimately related.

Let me say right away that I have a considerable measure of sympathy with both proposals. If the Board could be reduced in numbers without doing damage to the fabric of the Society's life or lessening the interest of the churches I should be glad to see it smaller. The marvel is that a body so large in its numbers is yet so wise in its judgments. It rarely makes a mistaken decision on an issue of importance. It generally keeps its head and refuses either to be swayed by sentiment or dominated by individuals. Again and again it has risen magnificently to a great occasion, and I have repeatedly found its sessions to be a real means of grace. Similarly, if the L.M.S. and the Congregational Union could be more closely linked without sacrificing anything that is essential and precious to

each I should rejoice. The marvel is that what seems a somewhat loose relationship is in actual practice so satisfactory and effective.

But the more I have thought about these two proposals the more conscious I have become of the difficulties in the path of their adoption.

Take first of all, the size of the Board. It consists at present of 339 Directors, 220 being elected, 63 co-opted—in order to secure continuity—and 56 Honorary. The Honorary Directors consist of the Chairman, Secretary, and Honorary Secretary of the Union, the Principals of the Theological Colleges, certain representatives of the Congregational Unions of Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Australia, and New Zealand, together with a few people who have rendered distinguished services to the Society. Admit, if you like, that this is an unwieldy body. The problem is to find an adequate alternative.

There are Directors of the Society still living who can remember the Board as a small body of about fifty people. They met once a month and sometimes more often than that. It was a devoted and an efficient body. But it became necessary to enlarge it greatly, and for two main reasons. In the first place, the volume of business necessitated such frequent meetings that Directors from the more distant parts of the country could not afford the time or the money unless they were people of leisure and means. The result was that the Board tended to consist of London people or of leisured folk from the country. In fact the criticism at that time was that it was too much the *London* Missionary Society.

The Board was accordingly greatly increased in numbers, and the new Directors were so distributed that Congregationalism in every part of the British Isles had effective representation in direct proportion to its strength. But since such a body was far too big to bring to London once a month for the transaction of the necessary business, it was decided to put the main burden of administration on the Standing Committees. These Committees meet monthly and consist of about twenty-five or thirty people each and their membership is so distributed as to secure that every part of the British Isles is represented. Under this arrangement the Board meets four times a year, receives the reports of the Standing Committees, and give its attention mainly to important matters of the moment, or to large questions of policy. This method has in practice worked well. The members of the Standing Committees give careful and (what is important) consecutive service, while the Board has developed a kind of instinct for concentration upon the big issues. My conclusion is that on the whole this plan of a large Board, meeting only four times a year, with responsible Standing Committees meeting monthly, has worked more effectively than might have been expected.

I suppose that the only possible alternative to a large Board is a small effective body of about fifty people. This would be quite

large enough if it is really to master the details, particularly of the foreign administration. These fifty people would have to meet at least monthly. In no other way could the business of the Society be transacted. At present over two hundred hours per year are spent in Committee work at the Mission House. To that has to be added the time spent in travelling. A man from, say, Manchester might well find himself called upon to devote far more time than he had at his disposal. The result might well be that in place of the present surprisingly youthful Board, the Directors would tend to be mainly elderly or leisured people with the double danger of conservatism in policy and a lack of effective contact with the Churches. Nothing is more important for the L.M.S. to-day than, first, to be sufficiently youthful and forward-looking to adapt policy to the needs of the time, and, second, to have close and living contact with the home-Churches.

But the reduction of the number of Directors from three hundred to, say, fifty, would mean the disfranchisement of large areas of Congregationalism. Yorkshire, for example, which now has 26 Directors on the Board, would in future have only about 4. The whole of Scotland, with its magnificent missionary traditions, would have to be content with 2 or at most 3 Directors. Whole counties like Dorset or Northamptonshire or Derbyshire might well find themselves with no Director at all. The representative character of the Board would largely disappear. The churches, the Auxiliaries, and the County Unions would not feel that they had any direct access to the Board. It would tend to become a rather remote body.

Moreover, the reduction would do serious damage. Membership of the Board is greatly prized and will not be readily surrendered. It would be no easy task to persuade some five-sixths of the country, now represented on the Board, to give up that representation, or to merge it in larger areas. Not only would the proposal be strongly opposed, but, if forced through, it would cause widespread disappointment and dismay. It is highly doubtful whether the gain in efficiency would be worth the loss in confidence and goodwill. The advantage of a small Board might well be purchased at too high a price.

Turn, secondly, to the relationship of the L.M.S. and the Congregational Union of England and Wales. The present relationship is one of co-operation; the alternative would seem to be one of control. Presumably this would mean that the Board would become a Committee of the Union, appointed by it and responsible to it.

The advantages of this are, first, that Congregationalism would feel a greater moral responsibility for the work of the L.M.S. than it does now, since the Society would more obviously "belong" to it; second, that the Union would be the final court of appeal in all matters of home and foreign policy with the right to decide what foreign obligations should be undertaken and what financial appeals to the

home churches should or should not be made; and, third, that Congregationalism, being thus centrally controlled, could act as a unit and bear its witness much more effectively both at home and abroad.

I see many important and even fatal objections to this.

In the first place the L.M.S. is the officially adopted missionary society not only of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, but also of the Congregational Unions of Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Union of Welsh Independents, and of the Wesleyan Reform Union. Control by the Congregational Union of England and Wales is quite incompatible with the honourable and long-standing relationships of the Society with these other bodies. It would be difficult to exaggerate, for example, the value of the relationship between the L.M.S. and the Congregational Union of Scotland. No part of British Congregationalism has given the L.M.S. so many missionaries in proportion to its membership. To secure closer attachment to one Union at the cost of detachment from the others would be neither wise nor statesmanlike.

In the second place, the genius of Congregationalism does not fit it for the control of such a vast responsibility as the L.M.S. The position might be different if Congregationalism were a completely connexionalized Church. It is a voluntary association of churches which are not administered by the Union but administer themselves. The L.M.S., on the other hand, is a centralized body formed for administrative purposes, the Board bearing final responsibility for the Society's work, and possessing the garnered experience of nearly 150 years of administration. It is hardly to be expected that a non-centralized denomination could suddenly accept responsibility or develop the aptitudes for administering a vast enterprise scattered over three continents, which is served by 8,000 Europeans and other Nationals, which owns more than a million pounds worth of property, and which enters into large undertakings with governments and other bodies.

In the third place, Congregationalism does in fact determine the policy of the L.M.S. at every point. The home organization of the Society is based on the Auxiliary system, and the Auxiliaries are, without exception, made up of Congregational churches. The Society's home-machine is thus exclusively Congregational. So far as the Board is concerned every one of the elected Directors is a Congregationalist. The only non-Congregationalists are a small handful who have rendered outstanding services to the Society. In fact out of the 339 Directors on the Board only 9 are not Congregationalists. And these nine are, without exception, either Honorary or Co-opted Directors. That is to say, while their presence and help are of great value, they are not keeping anyone else off the Board. There is, it seems, very little reality in the statement that Congrega-

tionalism does not decide what the L.M.S. shall or shall not do in its home or foreign policy. In point of fact Congregationalism already possesses all the control over the L.M.S. it can rightly desire. The only thing it does not possess is responsibility. And no one seriously suggests that it should.

Let it not be supposed that I am apologizing for the presence on the Board of this small handful of non-Congregationalists. I am proud of their presence, and I rejoice that the Society is big enough to find room for them. My point is that they are so few that they neither lessen the determining authority of Congregationalism, nor oust any Congregationalist from the Board.

It should be frankly stated that the wide evangelical and inter-denominational position of the L.M.S. has been an increasing asset in recent years. During the last decade the income of the Society from non-Congregational sources has considerably increased. It is perhaps providential that during the very years when Congregationalism's missionary contributions have fallen, the income from outside sources has grown greater. The case is even more clear in regard to candidates. During the last few years there has been a dearth of Congregational candidates and just when the need was greatest several excellently qualified candidates were forthcoming from outside Congregational ranks. Had it not been for the help in men and money that has thus come the Society's position would have been extremely grave.

It is worth while recalling the fact that an authoritative pronouncement on the Editor's two suggestions was made less than ten years ago. In 1927 the Board decided to set up a Commission of Enquiry into Home Administration of the Society. The Commission was to "consist of six men of known business capacity, three to be nominated by the Congregational Union and three by the Society". The nominees of the Union were Mr. Owen Kentish, F.I.A., the Union's present Treasurer, Mr. W. F. Wrigley, F.C.A., a former Treasurer of the Union, and Mr. Owen Ward, J.P., a former Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of the Union. The L.M.S. nominees were Mr. F. G. Bowers, C.B., C.B.E., A.C.A., a Director of the Society, and Accountant General of the Ministry of Labour, Mr. H. G. Judd, C.B.E., C.A., an eminent Presbyterian layman, and Mr. F. A. Steele, F.I.A., the Financial Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. The Commission sat for several months and presented a unanimous Report.

In regard to the size of the Board the Commission reported:

> A much smaller Board would suffice for the actual dispatch of business, but it is of considerable value in the constituency that a large number of persons should share in the work of the Board; it spreads interest as well as information; it increases the contact between the Mission House and the constituency; and,

when any large question is afoot, it is a real gain to know that the decision receives the assent of a large and representative gathering.

But if they recommended no substantial change in the size of the Board they proposed a far-reaching change in its constitution. Up till that time the majority of the Directors had been elected by the Auxiliaries; but from that time onward the majority were to be elected by the National and County Unions. This meant that official Congregationalism, as distinct from Congregationalism functioning through the Auxiliaries, was to have a majority voice in L.M.S. affairs. The figures were:

	Before 1927	*After 1927*
Appointed by the National and County Unions	62	162
Appointed by the Auxiliaries	155	70

In regard to the relationship of the L.M.S. and the Union I cannot do better than quote some paragraphs from the Report:

> Organic union has been suggested to us, but after careful consideration we have reached the conclusion that it would be impracticable and unwise to carry on the work of the Society as a department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. This is not because we think it would interfere with the "fundamental principle" of the Society—it need not; nor merely because the Society still receives a certain amount of support from other denominations or employs a substantial number of missionaries belonging to other communions, though the last point is one of some importance. Apart from questions affecting the foreign field, the primary objections to organic union are two:
>
> (*a*) Nearly 20% of the income of the Society is derived from Congregational sources not directly associated with the Congregational Union of England and Wales, and
>
> (*b*) the Society's work is so large and complex that it could not well be administered by a department of any other ecclesiastical organization.
>
> Organic union has been urged from some quarters on the ground that the Society without the knowledge of the churches embarks on policies which result in deficiency and then asks the churches to pay the bill. This is not a fair representation of the Society's financial policy. Further, the argument seems to overlook the fact that all the elected Directors on the Board are elected by representatives of Congregationalism, and in any case the difficulty, if it exists, can be met far more simply than by organic union. There is, in our opinion, an overwhelming case for establishing as close relations as possible with the Congregational Union of England and Wales (and County Unions) and with the other national Congregational Unions.

The Report goes on to make various recommendations in regard to the relation between the Auxiliaries and the County Unions, to the submission of an annual missionary report to the Assembly of the Union, and finally to the officers of the two bodies.

> The Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales should be ex-officio an Honorary Secretary of the Society and . . . the General Secretary of the Society should be ex-officio Honorary Missionary Secretary of the Union . . . The Treasurer of the L.M.S. should be ex-officio a member of the Council of the Congregational Union and of its General Purposes Committee . . . The members of the Secretariats . . . should meet at intervals at some suitable place for fellowship and conference.

The Commission dealing expressly with the proposal that the two publication departments should be amalgamated reported:

> On the whole we do not think this would be advisable. A propagandist body like the L.M.S. needs to have direct and unfettered control over its publications, for they are an integral part of its propaganda. The Congregational Union and Independent Press Ltd. differ from the L.M.S. in that they are not primarily propagandist, as the Society is, and must be on its home side.

In view of the fact that there has been no important change since 1928 on any of the points mentioned the findings of the Commission may be regarded as still valid.

"CHRIST IN MY JOB."

By the Rev. Geoffrey Walker, M.A.

The idea was not entirely an original one. It is nearly three years ago that a Sunday afternoon 'bus ride to an evening appointment took me through Bradford. I was dozing when the 'bus jerked round a corner. As I climbed back on my seat a notice board outside a church caught my eye, and I saw "Well-known Doctor from Bradford Infirmary". Whether the board actually bore the words "Citizenship Service" or "Christ in My Job" also I cannot say: it is quite possible.

I make, therefore, no claim to originality. I go further, and admit that, had it not been for the advertisement I saw, the idea for such a series of services would probably not have germinated in my own mind.

At the time I thought little about the doctor and his talk, except to hope that he and the audience had a useful and profitable time. But at intervals the notice board flashed its picture across the screen of my mind, and after twelve months, without consciously building it up, the scheme formulated itself.

Great Harwood, near Blackburn, is a cotton town, which, until

quite recently, had the third largest unemployment percentage in Lancashire. (The only two towns which had higher figures are not cotton towns, but are in the Furness district.) About seven mills were working out of twenty-two, and nearly half the working population was unemployed. This meant that although the churches, generally speaking, were loyally supported, there was a great number of people who, in view of the situation, wondered what Christ and the Church had to do with daily life. I wanted them to know.

Besides, I can enter the pulpit ninety to a hundred times a year and preach the Gospel as I understand it and have experienced its power in my own life. But this is my job, and I am expected to do it, so that whilst my own congregation listens to me week by week, nobody else cares. I wanted them to care. I felt—and I suppose the feeling is common after nearly two years in the ministry—that I was not getting anywhere. I was making no impression outside my own church, and I was keenly anxious to make one.

This was not to be a "stunt". I am apprehensive of stunts, and apprehensive of being written down as a "stunter". It was to be a practical attempt to bring a practical Christianity into the lives of men and women who felt no need of a Gospel, or, perhaps more truly, did not know where to turn to find one, and were suspicious of the churches. So I had no intention of blazoning the business abroad; it was the folk in Great Harwood I wanted to reach.

I began the preparations in June, 1936, by outlining the scheme to my deacons, and they gave me full permission to organize it as I wished. It was to be a series of services called "Citizenship Services", in which laymen would speak on the subject, "Christ in My Job", each looking at it from his own angle, but all trying to get home the challenge and help of Christ in daily life. The title for the series covered the idea of making better citizens of the town and of the Kingdom of God, and the subject demanded a practical message which could be a great help to the ordinary listener. As I sent out the invitations to various laymen I told them that I did not want them to preach; I could do that—more or less satisfactorily—myself. What I wanted was a straightforward talk on "Christ in My Job", each man telling in a plain way what Christ means to him in his daily life and work, the demands that Christ makes and the help Christ gives.

The services were to be held fortnightly on Sunday evenings at the usual time of evening worship. I was to take the service apart from the address, and there were to be half a dozen speakers, with myself as a possible seventh to complete the series.

Six seems to me the right number of speakers. Fewer would be insufficient as a representative selection of trades and professions, and more than six would take up too much time. I hesitated whether to have the services monthly or fortnightly, and decided (and am

still of the opinion) that fortnightly is better. It may appear to make inroads into a man's own preaching to have a visitor every fortnight for three months, but so long as there are to be six speakers, the effect will be the same. What does matter a great deal is to keep up the interest of the public, so that contact is not lost between one speaker and the next.

I wrote down an ideal six representatives of the trades and professions, and proceeded systematically to approach them. I first asked the Mayor of Blackburn to open this series of "Citizenship Services" by speaking on "Christ in My Job as Mayor, Magistrate, and Citizen". He immediately and graciously accepted the invitation, and I thought the rest would be easy. It wasn't. The Mayor accepted in June, and although the series was beginning in October I did not fix up another speaker until the end of August. My ideal six dropped to pieces, and I began to hunt round almost desperately for any man who met the essential conditions of being (i) a Christian, (ii) a regular church attender, (iii) a good speaker. From this experience it will be understood by anyone who proposes to inaugurate such a series that in any place of smaller size than a city (where there are presumably many on whom one could call), it is wise to plan nearly six months ahead. The half-a-dozen first planned included the Mayor, a Doctor, Teacher, Cotton Mill Owner, and Cotton Operative (for obvious reasons), and a Joiner or Carpenter (also for obvious reasons). The six finally secured differed from this list in that doctors and teachers would have nothing to do with the idea (rather surprisingly to me), and I fought shy of approaching a joiner and eventually did not do so. The substitutes were a Miner, Workpeople's Hospital Fund Secretary, and a Probation Officer. Thirteen mill owners were approached and all refused, some of them in letters which are worth keeping, and which say a good deal between the lines about the difficulties of the cotton trade during the last ten years. The fourteenth accepted in the following fine sentence: "I should prefer to say 'No' to you, but an inward monitor says it would be an act of disloyalty, so here goes; faith must be put to the test". I wound up the series by speaking on "Christ in My Job as a Parson", and it did me more good than anyone else.

Needless to say, some of the speakers were better than others, and those who most obviously held the people were those who kept closely to the subject and spoke in a practical way. In spite of a close definition of what was wanted, one or two went off into attempts at preaching; they were least successful. Perhaps the most gripping was a dear man who acknowledged that he was "no eddicated speaker", and interspersed his remarks with "summat" and "nowt", and kindred North Country words. His talk, and the fact that the church was crowded when the Cotton Operative gave his splendid address, made me think that far greater use could be

made of the laymen in our churches. The problem is how to realize their usefulness in some way other than, and in addition to, lay preaching. I cannot suggest any solution to the problem after much thought, but someone else may be able to do so.

We sang from hymn sheets, and the congregation obviously enjoyed what we call "hearty singing". We attracted many strangers, and many came whose connexion with the church is only nominal. As anyone can guess, most of the strangers did not remain with us after the end of the three months, though a few did. But the two most valuable results were in other directions. First with those attached to the church. I had been with them two years, and it had begun to dawn on them that I was not the Angel Gabriel. There is no doubt that these services kept in my congregation for at least a third winter some who would otherwise have drifted out. And second, and to my mind a tremendously important thing, we gave to men outside the church, in a way we could not have done otherwise, a clear understanding that there is something in Christianity that has to do with ordinary life. There were many who had passed the church doors thousands of times to whom the church had been only a building in the street. Some of them learned, or re-learned what they had forgotten long ago, that Christ and His Gospel do concern them; there is a challenge they need to meet, and there is a help they cannot get elsewhere.

THE RECALL TO RELIGION.

THE PRICE TO BE PAID

By the Rev. W. E. Booth Taylor.

It was in the closing days of last year that the Archbishop of Canterbury made his appeal. Since then his plea has received the hearty support of all the Free Church leaders, the approval of the majority of the rank and file in the churches, and a good Press. It is true, however, that the appeal has been adversely criticized and doubts expressed as to whether it would make any difference to the religious life of the nation.

What the final result will be it is yet too early to estimate, but a review of the position generally suggests that unless the appeal is soon backed by courageous action, unless deeds follow words, the religious life of the land will scarcely be affected.

From personal observation, and after discussion with ministers in different parts of the country, it is clear that, so far, the appeal has made little or no difference to the size of our congregations. Few who were not in the habit of worshipping have been persuaded to seek God in His sanctuaries. It would be interesting to know if the increase which was observed in the numbers attending Easter Com-

munion in certain Anglican churches has been maintained. One is aware that there could be a renewed interest in religion which would not at first manifest itself in increased attendance at worship. Nevertheless, if there is a renewed interest one would expect to see some evidence of it by now.

One disconcerting factor is the apparent indifference of youth. How far the views of Mr. E. B. Castle, Headmaster of Leighton Park School, Reading, are shared by other headmasters, I cannot say, but his article in *The Spectator* of March 5th made disturbing reading. The following extracts do not, I think, misrepresent the sense of the whole :

> . . . it is the refusal of the Church to be a crusading Church which is at the bottom of youth's refusal to accept its guidance . .
>
> There is no note of prophecy in the Church. If the Bishops are to get at the mind and soul of contemporary youth they must demand of them more than acquiescence in an established order . . .
>
> A young man said to me recently after reading the Recall to Religion : "The Archbishop had a slap at the 'poison' of godlessness in Russia, but the godless Russians are tackling poverty as I have seen no bishop tackle it" . . .
>
> They (youth) believe that they have in the eradication of war and poverty a tremendous call to duty . . . but when they look for leadership they do not find it in the organized Church. Instead they find confusion, indifference and even opposition.

(Mr. Castle makes it quite clear that he is "not so much concerned to assess the justice of the position but, rather, to see the picture as they see it.")

Turning to the social life of the nation we find that for the most part the appeal has fallen on deaf ears. The advertising campaign of the brewers, which, in its disregard for truth and its determination to make the youth of Britain "beer-minded", has become vicious, shows no signs of diminishing. If anything, it is being intensified. It is sad to see in the report of the Chief Constables to the recent Licensing Meeting that drunkenness is greatly increasing. In Canterbury it increased in 1936 by 54 per cent over 1935, a greater percentage increase than in Birmingham, Blackpool, or Coventry.

Attendance at Race meetings has certainly not been lessened by the Recall to Religion. The interest taken in this "sport" appears to be wider than ever. And, to the regret of many Christian people, it appears to have the hearty support of Royalty. The actual racing may be harmless enough, but it cannot be thought of apart from gambling, and this unsocial and unchristian habit is taking hold of ever-increasing numbers of people of all ages and of both sexes.

Football-pool betting has become almost a national disease and it is still rapidly spreading. The following is from the *Baptist Times*, 25th March, 1937 :

> Dr. Carlile, at the Folkestone Education Committee, moved a resolution: "This Committee notices with profound regret that advertisements relating to football betting pools appear on tickets issued on cars operating in the district and carrying scholars to and from school; that such advertisements have a detrimental effect on the welfare of the children; and that the attention of the Minister of Transport, the Car Company, and the Association of Education Committees be called to the subject".
>
> Dr. Carlile said it was a scandal that magistrates would lecture boys upon the evils of tossing halfpennies at the street-corners and remain silent while public companies and some municipal authorities advertised gambling in the most attractive way.

With regard to the films it is perhaps too early to say whether or not the producers have heeded the Archbishop's appeal, but one is deeply concerned to find that film after film, of both British and American production, is not entertainment merely, but a powerful advertisement for one or other of the major social evils: drinking, gambling, ridicule of the sanctity of marriage; and disregard for law and order. Nor do the "News films" miss any opportunity of showing military, naval, and air force displays. And what a harvest the coronation supplied in this respect! One had hoped that the Recall to Religion would have carried with it an appeal for the modification of this aspect of the coronation. A forlorn hope! Dr. Inge's words in a recent essay are pertinent:

> I wonder whether others felt as I did at the 1897 Jubilee, with its almost insolent parade of power and prosperity. This is a real *fin de siècle*, I said to myself, a Nebuchadnezzar's boast, "Is not this great Babylon that I have builded?" Nemesis awaits this kind of pride, and nemesis was already at the door.

It would seem, then, that the Recall to Religion has not met with an encouraging response. What is the next step? Is it not to take action? To substitute deeds for words? To say less and do more? Is it not clear that unless action is taken the masses outside will never take either the Church or its leaders seriously?

Our first task is not to try to get more people into our churches. They will in all probability come when other conditions are fulfilled. Primarily, we in the churches must do those things which will compel the outsider to believe that leaders and people are sincere and in terrible earnest about the Christian life. Only by a courageous and self-sacrificing example can we persuade others that we take Jesus and His teaching in all seriousness. Nothing short of this will win the respect of those who at present are either contemptuous of, or indifferent to, the Church of Christ. Once we have won their respect we shall be able to influence them. It does not follow that they will

flock to the churches immediately. Our new way of life may cause some to hate us. Better to have their hatred, however, than their cynicism or indifference.

The pamphlet *Men, Money and the Ministry,* contains many courageous admissions of wrongs waiting to be righted in the Anglican Church. The Foreword is over the names of numerous bishops, clergy, and distinguished laymen. The names of Canterbury, York, and London, however, are conspicuous by their absence.

> p. 1. The big moral and spiritual issues of the day are recognized as being economic. . . . and nowhere is the time-lag more pronounced than in the Church . . .
>
> p. 3. If this economic reform of the Church is not to be dangerously delayed, it is for its youth and those who in other circles would be reckoned to be middle-aged to take a vigorous initiative. Courageously carried out it would release much spiritual power. For the Spirit of God always breaks into human life conspicuously at the point of action—when men and groups do without fear or delay what they know is right.
>
> p. 4. The material wealth of the Church is considerable—roughly seven and a quarter million pounds *per annum*. What would not the Prudential and the Communists make of such a chance?
>
> p. 5. . . . much in the institution—*qua* organization—does not command moral assent either within the Church or without. From some points of view . . . it wears the ungracious character of a vested interest.
>
> p. 6. Ninety-nine per cent of miners throughout the country disapprove of mining royalties. . . . The Church cannot hope to evangelize successfully a body of men who are strongly prejudiced against the sources of its supply.
>
> p. 7. The average stipend of bishops is over £4,000 . . . most of it goes in expenses not in joyous living. But is it wise to continue that which requires so much explaining and leaves a lingering prejudice?
>
> p. 30. If only the subject is discussed in terms of the welfare of God's people and the service of our Lord and not merely in terms of property rights the clergy will, for the sake of the morale of the Church, be led to accept the same conditions as obtain in less sheltered professions.
>
> p. 48. We must preach the Sermon on the Mount as a community which practises it and knows from experience that it is the right way for men to live. We are not doing that. We preach and pray one thing and the institution proclaims another. But our Churches, only a little less markedly than the Free Churches, are exhausting their energies in the effort to maintain their own existence.

This and much more is fully admitted, all leading to the searching question, How dare we order others to put their house in order whilst

our own is in such disarray? (The Pamphlet makes no mention of the fact that in a great number of schools in the land headships can only be obtained by those who are either members of the Anglican church or are willing to join its Communion, neither does it refer to the fact that the Anglican church is losing no opportunity to gain control in many of the new schools that are being built.)

The Free Churches, it is true, may not be faced with such grave financial issues as those in the State Church, but let it be frankly said that the disparities in the stipends of ministers in the Baptist and Congregational Churches would call forth scathing comment on the part of many outside the Church if the facts were known. They are certainly not indicative of the spirit of brotherly love or of bearing one another's burdens. And how often it seems in our committees and assemblies that we face our problems with an eye to Denominational and Independent tradition rather than to what is in accord with the Will of God and the Spirit of Christ. Expediency so often triumphs over righteous principle. Not by such methods, however, did Christianity take root in history, and not by such methods has the Church experienced revival or the masses of the people been recalled to religion in later ages.

To eradicate these wrongs will involve much heart-searching, much courage and self-denial. By these very acts, however, new strength will be given to our preaching and our personal witness. Gradually the outsider will notice a difference in us. And the New Testament and history offer abundant evidence to prove that the Church is powerful to influence the unchurched masses of the people only as she shows a courageous, suffering witness to the world.

If this land of ours is to be won to a deeper concern for spiritual things one thing else is urgently needed. The Gospel and the Christian ethic must be proclaimed vigorously and powerfully in the open air. A beginning has been made but for the most part our churches are very timid of open-air activity. In Protestant England Christian witness in the market places and at the street corners should not be left to Roman Catholic Evidence Societies! We ought never to forget that New Testament preaching was for the most part open-air preaching. The outsider of New Testament days was not won by the preaching of two sermons once a week on Sundays within doors but by open-air preaching, by personal evangelism, and by a willingness to suffer for the cause. Missionary preaching in every age has, for the most part, been in the open air. Wyclif, Wesley, and Booth followed the example of their Master and of Paul and took the Gospel to the multitudes. So must we. What went ye *out* for to see?

The wireless will not help us much. Wireless sermons, helpful as they are, must be, for the most part, of the soothing, comforting type rather than rousing and disturbing. Few and far between are the wireless sermons which sting men into a consciousness of sin and

convince them of their need for a Saviour. The genius of the pulpit was never higher than it is to-day. But we need the genius of the "soapbox", too, if we are to reach the unconcerned, indifferent masses.

Studdert-Kennedy was a poet deeply sensitive to beauty and loveliness in language, yet he was prepared to let his sensitive nature suffer daily if by using the tongue of the common people he could recall them to religion and win them to Christ. Dr. "Dick" Sheppard, Dr. Donald Soper, and a few others have mastered the open-air technique. They have the ear of the people. Men are compelled to respect their burning sincerity. They exercise an influence for good over many who never attend worship, for people are persuaded that they are in terrible earnest about Jesus.

For many of us to attempt this work and to develop the open-air technique will be difficult. A big price will have to be paid. It will involve courage and self-sacrifice and an implicit trust in God's power to help. It will mean being willing to be fools for Christ's sake. But this, combined with a determined effort on the part of the Church to Christianize the institution, will, I feel, give new life to many listless people in our congregations and will recall many who are outside to take the Christian Church seriously and to surrender their lives to Christ.

PROBLEMS OF CHURCH FINANCE

By Harold Blundell, B.Sc.

Although most members and adherents have some idea of the financial condition of their place of worship, the declaration of surplus or deficit by the treasurer is an outstanding event in the calendar. Its importance lies in the fact that the condition of the church accounts determines the whole of the secular and not a little of the religious atmosphere of the place. Social events like bazaars and sales of work are governed by it; grants to external and deserving bodies are determined by it; the proportion of time occupied at meetings of the governing body of the church in the discussion of spiritual and temporal matters is fixed by it; and, in many of our churches nowadays, the economic anxiety of the minister is increased or decreased by it.

Whenever Church treasurers forgather the general complaint, in the North at least, is that the annual deficit persists, in spite of all efforts to wipe it out. In fact, there is a common belief in many churches that a debt is a healthy thing and a tonic which stimulates all sections to hard work. It is contended that the existence of a bank overdraft keeps people working together and promotes a good social tone. Nothing is said of the religious atmosphere of a place where almost every meeting is held with a view to "raising something",

where the bulk of the minutes of diaconates and councils is composed of financial items, and where even the warmth of a good devotional service is dispelled by an icy blast from the collection box.

The treasurer is indeed fortunate if his church is well supported by endowments. Unfortunately in our days the practice of legacies to the church is dying out. A man who in the old days was a pillar of the church often left the wherewithal to prop it up after his death. Hard times and democratic ideas have disposed of the old pillars and the burden is more evenly spread, or else, in cases where financial stalwarts do exist, they have so many calls to answer during their lives that they have not the inclination or funds to ensure the continuance of their support after they have passed on. We often find nowadays that income from investments has not sufficed to balance the budget, and that the capital itself has been used, if not by realization, then by the mortgage of the securities to cover loans.

In our own district the expenditure of our churches has been cut to the bone. Buildings depreciate for want of pointing, painting, and general overhaul. The wages of caretakers, organists, and others are reduced to the minimum of fairness and ministers' salaries are below the standard due to professional men with many calls on their pockets and families to educate. All that remains for us is, in cases where our buildings are too extensive to merit their continuance, to close or sell parts of them. One church I have in mind has closed its Sunday School, created an upper storey in a former lofty main building and transferred the old school activities upstairs. In many cases financial conditions demand that church and school activities be carried on in the same building where this is not already happening. Sentiment may stand in the way, but we cannot afford to indulge it.

Surveying the income side of our balance-sheets we find free-will offerings, or "collections", declining. In cases where pew-rents are charged these, too, show a falling-off. These two most important items in our financial statements are declining every year, reflecting the general lack of interest in regular churchgoing. The supporters of our places of worship may be divided into a number of concentric circles, and an examination of the formation is interesting. First we have the great central body of faithful members and congregations. Come what may, these keep the faith, attend services regularly, subscribe to almost every effort, attend important meetings, and take the problems of church life seriously. They spend much time in organizing efforts to fill in our financial gaps; they sell each other tickets for this or that social function; at annual bazaars they sell each other articles made, or bought at wholesale prices. Their church is dear to them and they strive and pray for its existence and welfare.

A second, more scattered array of supporters lies outside the circle of the faithful. It is composed of those who only attend special

functions, or who require constantly urging or reminding by the inner circle that they are welcome and expected at religious or social gatherings. Pressure needs to be exercised to persuade them to buy tickets or subscribe to appeals. Many of them are lukewarm worshippers, professing to "belong" to a church, yet addicted to Sundays at home or on the open road. They appear at re-unions and thereby profess to have fulfilled their obligations to the old place and to have qualified for another period of calling themselves Congregationalists.

The outer circle also calls itself Congregationalist. Its components have drifted away from the place in which they learned the old, old, story; or have grown indifferent or discontented with religion or the place itself; or else they have lost the love they had. Yet, should financial stringency cause talk of closing down, their voices are raised in loud protest and questionings as to what those in control have been doing. They still speak of the old church as being theirs; they expect its minister to be at their beck and call when required; and the only time they enter the place is to ask for Christian passports for travels over the frontiers of birth, marriage, or the valley of the shadow of death. They demand that the roof shall be kept over the House of God, yet they take no share in providing the covering. Hard words, you may say. Yet true and calling for serious thought.

How to increase our incomes, with expenditure already at the minimum of subsistence, is a grave problem. Appeals to friends and members and lukewarm adherents may result in temporary relief, but we must have larger and "live" congregations to ensure permanent improvement. Special services or "stunt" sermons by the minister may be an attraction, but nothing short of a return to religion and a change of heart can restore the life-blood to anæmic churches. Meanwhile, our faithful ones give all they can.

The manner of the giving is varied. In industrial areas, for example, the system of voluntary assessment and direct giving is not popular. Wage-earners are not willing to saddle themselves with promises to pay fixed sums when they are in jobs threatened with stoppage or wage reductions at any time. They prefer to give what they can, and hence the seat-rent and loose-cash collections are popular in artisan churches. Direct giving flourishes better among suburban dwellers of fixed salaries and steady budgets. Gaps between income and expenditure are bridged by sales of work or bazaars. At these functions there is much unproductive labour, but they are enjoyed and promote a good spirit. Very often during the period of preparation sections of the church hand over their spoils to the Church treasurer. He credits them with it on the day of days when sectional results are announced as part of the grand total, but often he has spent the hard cash long in advance. Between the failure of funds and the rescue work of special efforts, the bank is called upon to fill the financial gap.

Now banks on the whole are sympathetic towards churches. It may not always be apparent, but bankers respect Christian people, being Christians themselves. I once heard a banker say that no church had ever let him down, but that the habit of borrowing to unhealthy proportions was growing so rapidly that the line must be drawn somewhere. That is quite true. The banker is mainly responsible to his depositors and shareholders, many of them churchgoers, and is bound in honour to use their money wisely. He is loth to sell up churches and turn ministers from their manses to satisfy loans in default, so as a rule he calls for guarantees to cover overdrafts. These are very reluctantly given in many cases, but, even if not really needed on account of the character of church members, are wisely taken, for once a member of the finance committee has placed his name to his bond, he takes more interest in the spending of monies from the common purse or from the bank. The banker, after considering all the circumstances, usually establishes a limit of overdraft and has it covered by a guarantee. Conscientious church treasurers watch this limit and, by spurring on workers and givers, keep the floods below high-water mark.

I have in this brief and halting essay tried to outline the main financial problems of churches which, like the fine old place I have the honour to serve, have been hard hit by depression and the general fall in public worship. We squeeze the last ounce out of our faithful few; we appeal ceaselessly to our second, more lukewarm reserves; and we struggle, mostly in vain it must be sadly confessed, with the outer ring of those who wear the label, but do not share the burden. We receive steady help from the bank in times of stress, but are for ever faced with the unhappy vision of endless sales of work and similar efforts stretching far into the distant future, sapping the energies of our most faithful workers and leaving little time for spiritual development. Thus we carry on and try to hold our heads above water, keeping the churches ready for the return of the wanderers to the fold. When at last the great revival for which the faithful pray does come either from a change of heart or out of stark fear, the crowded churches of the future will stand as monuments to the loyal bands through whose labours the walls stood fast and the timbers firm and strong. By hard manual work, worry, and self-denial they keep the House of God proudly standing, and by their labours worship and pray more surely and fervently than in the most solemn or lavish ritual.

A FEW THOUGHTS ON MODERN TRENDS.

By the Rev. Harry Escott, M.A.

As a machine may run for some time on its accumulated momentum, so it is with some human movements. Liberalism in religion, with

its concomitant optimism in progress, exemplifies this principle.

The protagonists of that movement had hoped, by the application of the scientific method to the books of the Bible, and particularly to the Gospels, to arrive at a religion amenable to rational explanation. Whereas the present writer would be the last to minimize the value of the consequent reconstruction of the sacred literature of the Church, his main objection, so far as the interpretation of the Gospels is concerned, is that the Liberal critic came to their exploration with his mind already made up about their meaning and the nature of their message. The personal equation or the spirit of the age frequently determined the interpretation of what he found there.

* * *

It must be said in fairness, however, that from this Liberal approach to the New Testament there has accrued one commendable result. It has afforded the modern mind a new and living *rapprochement* with the human Jesus. No age, since apostolic times, has known Him as we do to-day. This lively delineation of the founder of a great historical religion is the most valuable and imperishable legacy of Liberal criticism to world culture, and was needed within the Church as a corrective to the medieval notion of Jesus which haunted our childhood like a pale ghost, and, in the days of our youth, added an atmosphere of unreality to Christian devotion and worship. The scientific handling of the Synoptic Gospels has confirmed one essential tenet of the Church's faith; that the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us. For this we need be thankful.

But human desire, when unrestrained, has an insidious way of manipulating data for its own convenience. It was not surprising, therefore, that the historical critic should interpret the Gospels merely as short biographical sketches of Jesus. It was neither historical nor scientific to whittle away, as inconceivable, all that would not accommodate itself to his limited methodology.

The Liberal critic often had a veiled distrust of the traditional theology of the Church. It is interesting to note, confirming this, the manifestation within Liberalism of a spirit of anti-Paulinism. The favourite slogan was "Back to the historical Jesus", and it was thought by many that Paul had misinterpreted the simple "teaching" of the founder of Christianity. Notice it was teaching that the Liberal critic found in the Gospels. To the historian Jesus was a teacher promulgating a new philosophy of life. The supernatural element was conveniently rationalized or expunged. Jesus was a man who had become, in a sense, divine through an absolute obedience to the movement of the divine spirit in mind and conscience. Such an interpretation could do no violence to the popular notion of evolution and the hope for the gradualness of human progress.

This dogmatic historicism endangered the peculiar witness of the

Church because there were countless philosophies to compete with Liberalism's "Philosophy of the Gospel". My own generation has thought of Jesus as an ethical teacher or social revolutionary in line with the ancient moralists, and differing from them only by reason of a deeper consecration to the moral ideal and direct alignment with a progressive religious movement. The gospel of Liberalism is another nostrum to aggravate the sores of a sick and nauseated world.

* * *

One does not forget the fact that the Liberal orientation of the gospel as a code of moral precepts gave birth to the institutional Church and a needed impetus to social reform. Yet has not the consequent secularization of the gospel made syncretism of Christianity with political movements the signal peril of the age? A while ago we heard of Labour Churches. Some preachers described Jesus as a young Communist. Others presented as a dogma the necessity for a Christian to be a Socialist. This toning down of the gospel to yet another creed of humanism has contributed to the pessimistic gloom that settles over Europe at this hour.

For this the Liberal theologian is in some measure to blame. But to-day his comfortable attitude to the transcendental verities of life is no longer popular and unquestioned. The present day resurgence of mysticism, the growing popularity of multifarious evangelical sects and semi-religious societies, and the return to a new Calvinism in the theology of Barth and Brunner, attest to a growing criticism of the Liberal position.

New Testament research in the hands of able scholars like Dibelius and Dodd has shown the Gospels to be not the simple historical transcripts that we were led to believe, but rudimentary interpretations of the faith of the Apostles and the early Church. There is as much theology as history in the Gospels, and the imagined dissonance between the preaching of Jesus and Paul is now not so evident. Moreover, Paul and the Synoptists appear to have moved in the same religious atmosphere, and were, each in his way, expressing the common faith of the Church.

This rediscovery of the New Testament has resulted, already, in a widening interest in Christian theology. Some publishers, awake to the signs of the times, have commercialized this new spirit of the age by inaugurating religious book clubs. A fresh stream of theological literature pours from the press every month, and the fact that most of it has for its purpose the clarification of the meaning of Christian faith seems to indicate that it answers the need of an age that had passed through dark disillusionment trying to reach the heavenly steeps by the crumbling babel of human reason.

* * *

But this new exploration of the significance of the content of the Gospels is only one contributory cause of the renaissance of theology. The other arises from the peculiar psychology of the modern world—the desire for authority.

This has shown itself in the emergence of authoritarianism in political thought and practice, and, in individual life, in the popularity of the psychotherapist. The man or nation, beaten by the tempests of life, must needs turn to some objective and external authority. The prevalent trust in human authority may mark the last tottering moment of our evasion of God, and its resulting pessimism and nausea may shatter our pride and prepare us for the saving decision of faith, which is surrender to the authoritative word of God in Christ.

I am one who finds in the poetry of a nation the surest index of its spiritual bearings. Above the self-pitying cacophony of these post-war years there is, at least, one coherent voice. I refer to Mr. T. S. Eliot, whom some of us have accompanied in spirit through the wilderness of early Narcissism to the self-liberating objectivity of Christian faith. Since Donne, with whom he has no small literary affinity, no poet's work is so revealing as Eliot's. His collected work presents the course of a spiritual pilgrimage from Man's Soul to the City of God, where the eternal paradoxes of faith offer a conclusion to all that is inconclusible. It is indeed a far cry from the pessimism of *The Waste Land* to the triumphant asseveration of Christianity in the choruses from *The Rock*. I close with one of them:

> . . . . Man without God is a seed upon the wind: driven this way and that, and finding no place of lodgment and germination.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER. EDINBURGH, 1937.

Readers of these pages will already be aware of the general course of events at the Conference. Here is a personal impression.

Four hundred and fourteen delegates from 122 Christian Communions in 43 countries gathered to pursue the deliberations begun at Lausanne in 1927 and carried on through the decade by the Continuation Committee and various groups. Attendance at such a Conference is far from being a holiday. When a denomination's representation is but small one is obliged not merely to stick closely to the major sessions but to take one's part in sectional discussions, while if roped in for a secretary's duties it often means working late into the night on drafts for the next day; I had this experience at Lausanne and so had sympathy with Dr. Dodd and Dr. Douglas Horton, Congregationalists who were called to this service at Edinburgh.

We British Congregationalists have a good deal to learn in regard to international Conferences. We do not, for example, make full use of the system of alternates as do the Americans, nor do we meet together either before or during the Conference as do other denominations. The English Methodists had spent a day together to discuss the agenda, the English Baptists stayed under the same roof, and the American Congregationalists had frequent meetings which other Congregationalists attended. The four English Congregationalists never met, except in casual fashion; to show our belief in freedom we stayed in different places and were as likely as not to express different opinions! When most other delegates can speak with a measure of confidence for their Churches it is all the more important that Congregationalists should be in close consultation, for so often they have to say in Conference, "Congregationalists have different views on this subject and I speak only for some of them".

The Archbishop of York made an admirable Chairman, ever ready with a form of words when arguments had reached a deadlock. Canon Hodgson was an excellent Secretary, and rarely has an international Conference run more smoothly; the interpreters did their work well. The non-English speaking delegates, however, scarcely got a fair deal: there is every excuse for British and American delegates to occupy themselves with their own concerns while speeches are being translated into French and German, but none for animated conversations with each other which prevent the French and German from being heard. Sometimes, it is to be feared, we were less than courteous to our Continental guests.

If the most picturesque members of the Conference were the representatives of the Orthodox Church its outstanding personalities were to be found elsewhere. Pastor Marc Boegner, of the Reformed Church of France, made a great impression by his learning, eloquence, and mastery of tongues. Bishop Palmer often intervened with effect; he is the Baldwin of the ecumenical movement, a master of astute simplicity; his indignation when a brother Bishop suggested that tendencious matter was being introduced at the last minute was a joy to behold. His brother of Gloucester, who had taken a prominent part in the preparatory work, was often on his feet; reactionary in politics, he seemed to be moving ecclesiastically, and on the last morning frankly declared:

Can we believe that Jesus Christ Himself would refuse to be present

at a good Presbyterian, Methodist, or Congregational sacrament, because there were no episcopal orders, when those persons sincerely desired to fulfil His command?

I cannot believe that, nor can I believe that He had one grace to give to Episcopalians and another for non-Episcopalians.

He has the useful gift of turning a deaf ear, and his countenance when Father Florovsky (*Et tu, Brute?*) told him to stick to history and not quote "silly and ridiculous illustrations which have no foundation in fact" was a study. Father Florovsky himself will never be forgotten by members of the Conference—his learning was equalled only by his volubility. Principal W. A. Curtis, of New College, Edinburgh, impressed all by his intellectual grip and fine temper. We had too few laymen, but Dr. G. F. Barbour and Mr. C. T. Le Quesne never spoke except to the point. The German delegation was sorely missed, all the more because Nathan Söderblom, all too soon taken away, had counted for so much at Lausanne, where the Lutheran view was much in evidence. Of the Americans Dr. Mott and Dean Sperry were prominent, but in sections rather than in the full sessions. The speaking generally was good and to the point. Occasionally there were striking phrases, as when we were warned "not to gloss over differences with a flood of mellifluous words".

If most of the discussion followed anticipated lines there were some surprises. We discovered that the Orthodox Church was not a solid *bloc,* and Archbishop Germanos publicly threw over Professor Arseniew: the Russians and the Greeks apparently do not always dwell happily together. It was rather startling, too, to find Pastor Boegner expressing doubts about a lay ministry; apparently experiences of *"prophetisme"* in France had raised doubts about the wisdom of unauthorized preaching.

As the Conference drew to an end two views were often heard. On the one hand were those who thought we were getting together, that despite radical differences about the nature of the Church, with its resulting divergence of view concerning the ministry and the sacraments, we were really reaching understanding; there was a vague feeling that though the way was yet far from clear the mist might suddenly lift and we should be able to go full speed ahead. On the other hand, many believed that the differences had become so clear as to show that no reconciliation was possible. How, it was said, could there be union between those who held that the unbaptized person, no matter how devoted, could not be a member of Christ's Church and those who felt, with Dr. Sampey, of the Southern Baptists, that in the discussions Church and Sacraments were being thrust between the individual soul and the Saviour as in some sense essential to salvation. An American was heard to remark as Archbishop Germanos was making a statement: "The swan song of a dying Church", and there were not wanting those who averred that it was a huge blunder for Christians who had freed themselves from bondage to endeavour to unite with what they believed to be moribund forms of Christianity. Those who desire to understand the Orthodox Church could not do better than read Father Sergius Bulgakov's *The Orthodox Church* (Centenary Press, 8s. 6d.), in which he says:

> The Orthodox Church takes part in the inter-confessional, oecumenical movements of our day in which Catholicism refuses to participate. Whence comes such a difference between the two parts of the separated Church? The participation of Orthodoxy in this movement does not at all signify that it can renounce any portion whatever of its tradition or that it can accept a compromise or re-consideration. On the other hand, relations with heterodox confessions may

aid the Orthodox Church to attain greater plenitude and breadth. Orthodoxy is present at such conferences to testify to the truth. These conferences are not councils, they are only preliminary assemblies, they are "conciliation". There are no reasons why Orthodoxy should avoid conferences. On the contrary, Christian love demands that the faith be testified to, that one be "all things to all men", as the Apostle said, "in order that by all means some may be saved" (*I Cor.* 9^{22}). Orthodoxy is not separated from the rest of the Christian world by a wall of absolute power, the papacy, whose preliminary recognition is imposed. Since this obstacle does not exist for Orthodoxy, it can enter into relations, in all liberty and sincerity, with the whole Christian world, remaining always that which it is itself. The Orthodox Church does not put its hopes on human efforts and the missionary zeal of its members, but it hopes in the power of the Spirit of God, Who lives in the Church and Who is leading the peoples toward unity. This unity may be found only in Orthodoxy. The Christian peoples of the world are now *seeking* Orthodoxy, often without knowing it. And they will find it, for it is said: "Seek and ye shall find".

Whether readers of this journal will find in this quotation ground for hope in continued conference we cannot tell. It must nevertheless be said that at Edinburgh we all managed to agree in an affirmation of unity and to walk together for a very long way. While it will, of course, be impossible for Free Churchmen to accept the Orthodox position if Orthodoxy cannot "accept a compromise or re-consideration" they can, nevertheless, see need for the Orthodox emphasis along certain lines.

A recently translated book, often quoted at Edinburgh, Dr. Wilhelm Stählin's *The Mystery of God* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.) shows that the Lutheran *ethos*, though quite different from that of the Orthodox, is equally strange to Free Churchmen, possibly because many Free Churchmen are of the sect or Anabaptist type: Dr. Stählin is as severe on the Anabaptists as was Luther, though happily he does not use the same language. There is much in the book which warms the heart; the exposition of the Church as a mystery which demands stewardship is very necessary to-day. Catastrophe came to the Church

> because the Church herself no longer understood herself as the result and realization of a *mysterium*, because she wanted to be everything possible—speaker, teacher, instructress, pastor, even sick-nurse, but hardly knew any longer what she is, and should be, "stewardess of the mystery of God".

In the emphasis he places on the outward symbols this Lutheran places himself with the Orthodox:

> The Sacrament of the Church is the stoutest bulwark against the etherialization of the divine mystery into a bodiless spiritualism. For this reason, too, the spiritual office of the Church needs its bodily forms and its conveyance of the gestures that carry the mystery. Only he who is inclined to volatilize the Church's mystery into being a mere dogma can regard the laying on of hands at ordination as a gesture, non-essential and unnecessary. The current of energy, of Jesus Christ, seeks to pass through the bodies of His servants and requires them as links of a mystical chain. One must have the courage to draw such conclusions too, if he believes that the saving of the world was born of the Virgin's womb and that the God-man, raised from the grave of the world according to God's secret will, is the First-born of a new Humanity.

It is now clear that only in two ways is progress possible. First, scholars from all the Churches must tackle the problem of the nature of the Church and its corollaries in regard to the ministry and the sacraments. Here are the two divergent views of the sacraments bluntly stated:

1. They were instituted by Christ and ordained by Him for perpetual observance. If we do not observe them we are disobedient to His commands. There can be no room in His Church for those who have not obeyed His commands, submitted to baptism by water in the name of the Trinity, and who do not regularly observe the Lord's Supper—"do this in remembrance of Me".

2. It cannot be proved that the sacraments were instituted by Christ. The early Church adapted them from other religions, and there has always clung to them superstitious ideas which they brought with them. If entirely spiritualized they are of value, but insistence on verbal accuracy and mechanical obedience proves that superstition has not been eradicated.

How is it possible to bring together the views of those to whom Church and Sacraments are of Dominical institution, central and necessary, and those whose hearts burn within them when they read Brunner's words:

> Where the word of God is preached and believed, where two or three are met together in Christ's name, there is the Church. Whatever else may be said about the Church, this assertion is fundamental. It has seldom been understood in all its revolutionary power. The meeting of two or three must be recognized to be the Church in however imperfect a form. When a father gathers his household to expound to them the Gospel, or where a layman out of a full heart draws round him a band of youth to listen to the word of God, there is the Church.
>
> But that is only the first step. Those who hear the word of God cannot remain mere individuals. They are impelled to seek community with all fellow-believers, and a community of love with non-believers with whom they may share their faith.

In endeavouring to reconcile these opposing views the Baptists, who have a foot in both camps, can be of the greatest assistance. They stress "believers' baptism", but what is important in believers' baptism? Is it obedience to Christ's command, water, or the open confession of Christ before men? Is it not the last? If all Christians are asked to confess Christ before men, doing it by immersion or other use of water, or without water—is not that the main thing? Cannot the Church of the future leave open the means so long as the end is secured? Would not this meet every difficulty—the admission to the Church of devout Christians in all the Churches who find outward symbols no help, the acceptance of the Friends and the Salvation Army, and the dissipation of the fear of those on the mission field lest "secret disciples" should multiply if there is no "water-baptism". In practice the Baptists solve the problem. Though in theory they say that only those are members of the Church who have confessed Christ by baptism, nevertheless they accept by transfer from other Churches those who were only baptized in infancy and probably some who have not been baptized at all.

If agreement could be reached on those lines infant baptism could take place with or without the use of water, such baptism being the recognition by the Church and the parents that the child belonged to the family of God and the determination by all to bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Similarly in regard to the Lord's Supper. Recognition by the Friends that the Lord's Supper "is the Church's most sacred act of worship",

combined with their statement "The Society of Friends in the silence of its meetings seeks without formal sacraments the real presence of Him who suffered death that men might have life" points the way to a solution. So long as those who belong to the Body of Christ meet to remember Him, His broken body and shed blood, is it necessary to insist that they employ the outward symbols?

Even more important than these discussions by small groups is the co-operation of the Churches in the work of evangelism. At half past eleven on the last night I persuaded the Conference to adopt as one of its 18 practical suggestions Lambeth Resolution No. 46 passed in 1930. The most effective means of union is by doing things together. Most of the people at Oxford and Edinburgh will perhaps remember best of all their worship together, worship in which men of so many races, countries, and churches were one. If the churches can unite in doing together that for which they primarily exist—winning men and women for Christ—they will discover their essential unity. The Lambeth Resolution reads:

> Meanwhile the Conference urges the desirability of organising and participating in efforts of Evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other Communions, both as a means of bearing effective witness to the multitudes who are detached from all forms of organized Christianity, and as a means of expressing and strengthening that sense of unity in the Gospel which binds together in spiritual fellowship those who own allegiance to different Churches.

That it has scarcely been implemented at all is a sad reflection on British Christianity. Even the most hopeful felt at Edinburgh that *by way of argument* we had almost reached our limit, that on the fundamental question, "The Nature of the Church", from which all our other differences spring, there seemed at the moment no reconciliation between what we might call the Orthodox and the Free Church views. Ten years spent in further discussion would be merely ploughing the sands. What then? Is the ecumenical movement dead? No. *Solvitur ambulando.* Can the Churches not in every land unite in telling the good news in Christ Jesus about which they were all agreed? If for ten years that can be done, I can see in 1947 a Conference in which we are not stating differences, or even registering agreements, but each advocating the right of other Communions (our proved allies in evangelization) to be part of the Church of Christ. I see a vision of a Conference when there is an impassioned oration by the Bishop of Gloucester claiming a place in the Church for the Quakers, a Baptist barrister championing the Orthodox, a Presbyterian Principal supporting the Anglo-Catholics, and, to crown all, Father Florovsky intervening in his delightful fashion to make "just two short remarks" to say that even those weird folk the Congregationalists must have their place in the Church of Christ!

That vision, I firmly believe, can be made a reality if we cease hammering at our theoretical differences in public controversy and unite in the task committed to us all. About unity, as about other things, it is true that he that doeth the will shall know the teaching.

ALBERT PEEL.

THE CONGREGATIONAL THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE, 1937.

I. By the Rev. JOHN MARSH, M.A.

THERE was nothing spectacular about the success of the 1937 Theological Conference of Congregationalists held at Keble College, Oxford, July 12th—15th. But a success it undoubtedly was; and this in three ways. First, there was a real progression of thought from Monday evening to Thursday morning; that is always helpful if sometimes unattainable. Secondly, both papers and discussions laid bare and grappled with the problems really fundamental to the matter in hand; that is essential to true success. And thirdly, the Conference came to envisage in a really marked way the possibility and the requisites of a distinctively modern yet thoroughly Christian theology; that was most gratifying in what was, as it was meant to be, the first of a series of five Conferences which will together cover the greater part of the theological field.

The subject under discussion was "Revelation and Faith", and the progression of thought was achieved by the preliminary statement of two more extreme positions, followed by papers which tended increasingly to conserve the positive values in both extremes and to point a constructive way forward.

The Conference opened with a paper on "Faith, Fact, and Knowledge", by the Rev. T. Wigley, who pleaded for the unification of the scientific and religious approaches to reality. There was no longer any defence, he argued, for dividing the real into two qualitatively different spheres or grades. In modern times Descartes had initiated this mode of thinking, and had only succeeded in burdening philosophers with unsolved and insoluble problems. The world which the scientist studied was one world, "mind-full", in varying degree, in all its parts. Man lived in this material-mental world and was himself in body-mind relation to it. There could no more be ultimate cleavage between the material and the mental, the natural and the supernatural, the real and the ideal. The world must be thought of "organism-ically".

But if reality is one, then truth is one; and we must reject all theories opposing judgments of fact to judgments of value, or "natural" to "moral" truths. Even philosophers like Kant who begin with two realms of truth are constrained in the end to postulate some underlying reality to unite them.

And just as reality and truth are one, so also is knowledge. All our knowing is conditioned by the subject-object relationship, whether it be a mere "awareness" of an object, or a developed "explanation" of it. Science always deals with fact, even in framing its hypotheses. An hypothesis, indeed, only differs from knowledge of fact in that it awaits verification.

In this latter sense of awaiting verification it is permissible to speak of "faith". The scientist has faith in his hypothesis, and such faith can be put to an experimental test. He also, and we with him, has faith that the world is intelligible, that real facts are knowable. This faith is tested as we apply our knowledge day by day. It is this tendency in man to have faith not only in reference to particular experiment, but also in reference to the whole, that gives rise to religious faith. For it is "the feeling for

the whole in its divine quality" that specifically characterizes the religious attitude. But our inquiry has enabled us to see the fundamental unity and continuity of such an attitude with the faith of the scientist in the intelligibility of the universe. Faith, like reality, truth, and knowledge, is one.

Wellnigh the opposite point of view was presented by Dr. F. W. Camfield in his paper "The Barthian Challenge". Our theological thinking, he urged, must not start from the world of nature and history and science, but must move wholly in the sphere of revelation and faith. That was not to say that nature, history, and science revealed nothing; but in them reason was confronted simply by an object, whereas in revelation reason was confronted by a Lord. God could never be, in the manner of "things", a mere "object"; he was always and essentially "subject". Reason must therefore surrender her sovereign rights and act in obedience to Him, and in confidence that what might seem to men to be two divergent paths would prove in the end to lead to the same goal.

When reason acts otherwise than in such obedience to her Lord, she is engaged in the construction of a world-view. It has even been thought to be the task of theology to construct one such world-view into which Christ could be integrated. But so to "justify" the world before one "justifies" the Christian revelation is quite contrary to the genius of the New Testament, where the world is not "justified" but "judged". In the New Testament it is not man, but God, who "sums up all things in Christ". Reason therefore dare not "sum up"; she can only obediently expound.

The Barthian challenge to let all our thinking move in the realm of revelation and faith is thus advanced on exegetical grounds: it does not arise from scepticism or despair. Indeed it challenges both philosophical scepticism and its opposite with equal vigour. Philosophy cannot come first. The Biblical method is to start, not with a world-view, but with God as Lord.

This becomes even clearer in light of the fact that the God of the Bible is not known in proportion as human reason understands the world, or human feeling or will is affected by it. God becomes known only as He makes Himself known, as He chooses to reveal Himself. Revelation is election. But equally election is revelation, for it is God's will to reveal Himself.

Such seeming divergence of philosophy and faith becomes even more apparent when we consider the cosmic significance of the Biblical revelation in its treatment of death and resurrection. To science the world is an ordered whole, and many a secular moralist has attained a radically optimistic anthropology. But the Bible characterizes man as a sinner, and the world as most deeply disordered and in inevitable decay. Only from God can man receive deliverance and immortality or the world be saved from its unavoidable doom. God alone is triumphant love. This is not a matter of scientific fact, but of divine revelation. Such revelation must be the source of all our theology.

Both these papers provoked keen discussion and aroused severe criticism; Mr. Wigley's because it seemed to leave little or no room for the specifically Biblical revelation, and Dr. Camfield's because it appeared to have no place for science, or for the use of what was commonly referred to as "reason". Yet it was probably only in the light of these two extreme papers that the Conference was able to recognize and assimilate so much positive and constructive thought from the three papers which followed.

Dr. R. S. Franks followed Dr. Camfield and spoke of "The Nature of Revelation". While he recognized, with Aquinas, a distinction between

reason and revelation, he thought it possible, with Justin Martyr, to show their identity. Reason, he claimed, could by its arguments discover the "place" of God in the world. This was exemplified in an interpretation of Kant's three great *Critiques,* in which Kant dealt in turn with our apprehension of the physical order, the problem of theoretical knowledge (*Critique of Pure Reason*), with our apprehension of the Moral Order, the problem of practical knowledge (*Critique of Practical Reason*) and with our apprehension of values and our experience of freedom and teleology (*Critique of Judgment*). These three *Critiques* show that our apprehension of reality is diverse and Dr. Franks would add to them a fourth and unifying apprehension—of the holy. But the important fact of Kant's analysis is this, that it is in the second *Critique* that God is discovered to us as the power which achieves moral ends in the physical world, and makes possible our achievement of them. Thus the centre of our metaphysical world is moral, and is fixed in a personal and creating God, for only a person could effect virtue, and only a creator effect it in a created world. The essential righteousness of God's will constitutes His love, and our love (ἀγάπη) for Him partakes of the same moral nature. In this way, on a strong ethical basis, Dr. Franks argued that both the validity and yet the eventual transcendence of the distinction between reason and revelation is shown. Reason, so to speak, "places" God in the metaphysical scheme; religion provides us with a direct experience of Him.

For the Christian, however, such direct experience of God is mediated by Jesus Christ, and this Christian experience must itself be tested by the critique of religious experience which our previous metaphysical construction provides. When we do apply this deeply moral critique we find that the prophets of the Old Testament are part of the same revelation which finds its consummation in the incarnation of Jesus Christ, in whom our metaphysical critique discovers a full and perfect life of love, by which man becomes aware of the act of God Himself. Thus can speculation offer a true critique of religious experience and revelation provide the concrete example of philosophical theory. Reason and revelation, though distinct, are one.

Dr. John Short, in his paper "Religious Experience and its Interpretation", was at one with Dr. Franks in deriving his own metaphysic from Kant. For Dr. Short all experience is in part conditioned by transcendental factors, and on such a metaphysical basis we are entitled to take our ideals as giving genuine insight into the nature of reality, and to discern in our spiritual experience a spiritual order both making itself known and realizing itself in the world.

In the interpretation of religious experience it was important to go beyond the ordinary range of explication. The world demanded and needed an interpretation in terms of ethics and economics which the Church had for too long withheld. Thus the orthodox view in answering the question "What are the conditions which make religious experience possible?" replies in terms of dogma: belief must be right if experience is to be true to type. While that is doubtless true so far as it goes, it is a weakness that it keeps (as it has long kept) orthodoxy from providing the Christian Ethic which the world needs.

Thus as an alternative to the orthodox answer we found answers of the psychological type. There were various descriptions of religious experience as consisting in certain feelings (*e.g.,* of dependence), which might be said to be inadequate both religiously and ethically. There was also the answer of liberal theology, which could be classified as a psychological answer in

that it began with the consideration of human need. But this "Christian Humanism" had itself failed to save the world from the disasters which threatened it, and had been powerless in time of war to achieve that which its own diagnosis had shown to be necessary. Dr. Short closed with a constructive plea for dialectical realism in theology, as expounded, *e.g.*, by Reinhold Niebuhr. This would perhaps involve moving politically to the left, and theologically to the right. Dogmas would be thought of not so much as statements of absolute truths which necessarily conditioned normal religious experience, but rather as "myths" enshrining truths—the bow from which the arrows of the Christian ethic were shot into the world. Christ expresses the organic relation of the eternal to the temporal, of God to the world; and unless we, in theology and politics alike, maintain that organic relationship, we deny the central fact of the Christian revelation.

In the last paper of the series the Rev. H. Cunliffe-Jones essayed a constructive task in a paper entitled "Man's Knowledge of God: a Constructive Statement". He began by claiming that historical religion was the true source of our knowledge of God. Natural theology could afford no common basis for Christian and non-Christian; the one would tend to infer more, and the other less, than the facts warranted or the argument sustained. Nor was it proper to reject a religious truth on other than religious grounds: the truth of religion must be critically tested in its own light. Confining himself to the history of the Christian revelation, Mr. Cunliffe-Jones claimed that the central point of the Biblical witness was the fact of redemption in Israel and of world redemption in Christ. Knowledge of this historically wrought redemption was, like all historical knowledge, truly rational; and yet it was a knowledge of faith. Faith in the redemptive mercy of God was thus man's act, yet one in which man must recognize the prevenient activity of God: for faith was God's gift, seeing that man did not acquire it by the mere will to possess it. So faith, in its truly rational grasp of history, did not say: "The facts, on which all can agree, are these; and this is faith's interpretation of the agreed facts, from which interpretation unbelievers may dissent": but faith said of what was usually called "interpretation": "These are the facts". Thus for faith it is not a fact that a child was born and interpretation that God was there incarnate, but fact that God was incarnate.

In thus starting from historical revelation to construct our Christian philosophy we are enabled to give a rightful place to the metaphysical arguments of natural theology. The classical "proofs" for the existence of God were not finally destroyed by Kant, even though they cannot now be held to prove all that they were alleged to prove. It is sufficient for us to recognize that the "proofs" demonstrate that it is more rational to believe in God than not to believe. This is a sufficient and a worthy contribution from a philosophical method which to justify religion excludes from its consideration all specifically religious phenomena.

Yet knowledge of God, if historical, cannot be derived solely from a mere past. It is not our untutored religious experience that is confronted with the story of our redemption; rather does that story come to us as members of the Body of Christ—the Church, wherein we not only learn of God's act of redemption in the past but also live in continued experience of His redemptive and sustaining grace by the same Lord and through the same Spirit.

Finally, the present writer was asked to summarize the work of the Conference in a more informal session on Thursday morning.

There were three problems which needed clarification before the Conference could be ready to deal with some of the big issues it had raised. First, how far is it correct to speak of all knowledge as in some sense a "revelation"?; and if correct, how is the specifically Christian and Biblical revelation to be distinguished within such a general field? Secondly, whether faith can correctly describe both the belief of the scientist in his hypothesis—even of the most general kind—and the Christian's belief in his Lord. Thirdly, there was the problem of the knowing relation. One extreme view posited this as the only known unity; another rejected it from theology as unable to describe man's relationship to Him who is always Subject; while others found it inadequate and assumed some divine capacity in man conditioning his knowledge of God. There was a serious epistemological problem to be faced.

The most significant thing that had happened in the Conference was that the protagonists both of an extreme immanentism and of an extreme transcendentalism had been constrained to modify their positions in order to give due centrality to the revelation in Christ. But in any Christian thinking this could be no mere peripheral adjustment; Christ must be Lord of thought, as of conduct and life. In this sense place must be given to Dr. Camfield's plea that Christian philosophy is not a "world-view".

Two kindred problems had been raised in discussion, that of the Transcendent and the Immanent, and that of the Eternal and the Temporal. With regard to the latter there was not only the important problem set by the fact that the "end" of the time-series had come in its midst, as sometimes the basic note of a chord came in the middle of an arpeggio, but there was also the difficult problem as to what general relations between time and eternity were implied by such an irruption of the eternal into time.

It could not be purely irrelevant what metaphysic a theologian held. Our "philosophy" affects our ability to understand or to accept the Christian revelation. While revelation must remain central and determinative of thought, the better the philosophy, the better, in general, would the theology be.

The Christian revelation was given in history; therefore the Bible is central. This emphasizes Dr. Camfield's contention that theology's task is exegetical. The Bible does not discuss revelation, it tells the story of our redemption, and thereby sets us the problem of the nature of revelation. Redemption, not revelation, is finally central. But redemption must be real; to give it reality would be to grant more to Dr. Camfield's interpretation of resurrection as triumphant love than had first been allowed.

If God thus reveals Himself to men in offering them His redemption in Christ, then in preaching and administration of the Sacraments we offer His redemption in His stead; whilst in hearing the Word, and partaking of bread and wine, we appropriate by faith that redemption which God offers in His Son.

This theological account of the Conference began by claiming that it was a success. Its success was not limited to the theological field. But beyond theological thinking and achievement "success" becomes a most inadequate word; for it was an unforgettable spiritual experience, not only to share in the daily worship of the Conference, and the prayer with which all the sessions both opened and closed, but even more to be of a fellowship which sought not to score debating points, but to attain Christian truth, and so seeking, was privileged in the end, in differing ways, to find.

II. By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A.

It would be with considerable trepidation that I offered my scattered impressions of the conference, if indeed I offered them at all, had I not been first assured that the serious work was to be done by my friend John Marsh. His article will clearly and fairly represent the Conference, which he showed himself able to interpret no less than to contribute to it, because his own thought was so enviably integrated: that being so, I need not hesitate to suggest my personal reactions, in the fear that they will be one-sided and unfair.

The Conference would certainly have been improved had Dr. Camfield and Mr. Wigley been leaders of groups; as it was, they were the solitary representatives of their positions, and, while their singleness in the Conference was perhaps proportionate to their numerical support in the denomination, it left their positions too dependent, maybe, on their personal expressions of it. The dispute with Dr. Camfield was in essence the same as that between the British and the Germans in Students' Conferences I have attended: from one point of view, anthropological, from another, epistemological. For him man, man's reason, and man's world were completely lost in the impotence of sin, nor could he allow that in man's knowledge of God God is ever the object of man's thought, ever a *datum*. As in other Conferences, we insisted that the latter statement is self-contradictory, and asked why the speaker was ready to read such a paper, masterly in its argument as well as in its emotional over-tones, if he did not think we were rationally capable of responding to it. The Barthian anthropology seems to outdo even St. Augustine, who at least allowed for an initial, creative, and general grace common to all men and found evidence in the very word *renovatio* that the original impression of God's image upon man was *non omni modo deletum*. The doctrine of Original Sin was necessarily stressed, and Dr. Camfield, while expressing an emotional abhorrence for a God responsible for the evil things in Nature, took his stand upon biblical exegesis (but the exegesis of whom? and why his?). Why, then, did Jesus love the little children, and say we must be like them? Because, being unconverted, they were the biggest sinners, as was said to me in Germany?

I came to the Conference fresh from a thesis on Faith and Reason in the Works of Bishop Pecock, the rationalist bishop who wrote against the Lollards, and it was curious to see how closely in some ways Mr. Wigley's position resembled that of Pecock. Mr. Wigley had all Pecock's distrust of intuition and of anything not susceptible to the dry light of reason; one wondered almost, as with Pecock, whether he really understood what is meant by faith at all, and whether his being was foreign to all experience of the æsthetic and of love. Strangely enough, it was Mr. Wigley himself who twice used the symbol of the revealing kiss; how this symbol fitted into his Cambridge philosophy—he was Cambridge among predominantly Oxford and Edinburgh speakers—I failed to understand. I wished, indeed, that the discussion had kept throughout more closely to the realm of the personal, to which Principal Franks (may I call him an impenitent Christian Humanist?) brought it back more than once. To compare man's knowledge of God to his knowledge of a table seems to me a scholastic sort of mistake: it is knowledge of the personal, and that alone, which is relevant, and the only real knowledge of the personal is the knowledge taken and given in a mutual love-relationship. We are fond of remarking the poverty of the English language with regard to *love* (though we rarely mention φιλία, which is the commonest form of

love to yield knowledge); why is it we so regularly forget its equal poverty with regard to *knowledge*? Even the most devotionally-minded amongst us seemed rarely to come beyond St. Bernard's *fide iam scio* to Melanchthon's *hoc est Christum cognoscere, beneficia ejus cognoscere*; and, as Mr. Plowright remarked, we tended to study *fides* to the neglect of *fiducia*.

This is not intended as a deprecation of the necessarily abstract form in which the thought of the Conference was expressed, but rather as a criticism of the points about which its thought revolved. The absence of a critique of religious experience was regretfully admitted, since Dr. Short's brilliant paper hardly touched on this, and he contented himself with insisting that the values postulated by man's *general* moral and religious consciousness may be hypostatized as real with as much validity as that with which the reality of the objects of scientific thought is postulated, which did not go very far; but, apart from this particular lack, the contrast between the thought of Prof. Cunliffe-Jones, who somewhat dominated the Conference, and of Principal Franks revealed in the former what I can only call a pre-Reformation emphasis, which to me was not a little disturbing.

Mr. Cunliffe-Jones expressed the contrast by claiming that the Christian revelation was a revelation in history, with which thought must be made to fit in, and by rejecting Dr. Franks's philosophical method of constructing a metaphysic, into which the revelation was then fitted. Although I should have thought that the more logical part of a metaphysic, the examination of the capacities and instruments of thought, was a *sine qua non* of theology simply *qua* thought—and Mr. Cunliffe-Jones later went so far as to admit that it was difficult to be a good theologian without also being a good philosopher—I was glad of this emphasis on history; but I was the more dismayed, when I learned what was meant. Mr. Cunliffe-Jones rightly claimed that (for knowledge, if not existentially) there are no pure facts, that history is the interpreted fact, though the interpreting of it is history too; but he seemed unwilling to accept the corollary that there may be more or less of interpretation as well as different interpretations, and that we cannot treat the interpreted fact as if it had not been interpreted, we must judge of the correctness of the interpretation. Absolute forms are as non-existent as pure facts, and the Christian revelation, just because it is historical, must submit to a criticism of the forms in which it was interpreted. What I mean by a pre-Reformation emphasis is the implicit assumption that by the Christian revelation we must (not only *can*, but *must*) understand the same as the Apostles meant and as the Church has always meant, and I call it pre-Reformation because it carries with it a theory of the unity of the Church over against heresy, which history disproves and Protestantism rejects. Whether we say we believe in miracles or not, it is foolish to pretend we look for miracles as part of the order of the day (*etiam nostris temporibus*: St. Thomas), as was done in earlier centuries, nor, whatever be our beliefs about inspiration, do we believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible in the way our fathers did: which means that we do not believe God reveals Himself in the way they thought He did, that we have other thought-forms. The Protestants retained the Creeds at the Reformation, but the God in Whom Luther believed as a Protestant was a very different God from the God in Whom he had believed as a Catholic: that the Creeds were retained means either that Catholicism had deserted them in life, or that they were dissociated from life altogether.

If this be true, I do not see how we can avoid criticism of both the

Church's and the Bible's interpretation of God's revelation to a far greater extent than Mr. Cunliffe-Jones seemed ready to allow. The early Christians were sure of two things, that through Christ they had found God and that Christ was living: I believe it was fundamentally for those two things that the affirmation "Jesus is Lord (κύριος)" stood, the tense as well as the predicate being stressed. As their conviction, those two things were the interpreted facts of their experience, and I think that to be a Christian means that one interprets one's own experience similarly. So much is necessary: it is not enough simply to believe that the Apostles were right in interpreting their experience as they did; but it is more than is necessary (if, indeed, it be possible) to go on to accept the thought-forms in which their thus interpreted experience of the revelation of God in Christ was elaborated by them in the New Testament or by the Fathers in the Creeds. We have to ask all the time, in the broadest historical sense, *quales homines interfuerint* (Calvin).

I am aware that this emphasis on the Spirit-guided use of the individual's private judgment is increasingly out of favour now, when liberalism is dismissed *en bloc* as atomic, when "community" is in the air, and when Barth joins hands with Neo-Thomism in decrying personality; but I do not see how it can be avoided. *Formgeschichte,* the fact that in the Gospels we have theological history, makes the exercise of our historical judgment more necessary, as with monastic chronicles, not less so. That I have given disproportionate space to this is partly because my own interests lie in history, but also, frankly, because I believe it to be important and to qualify Mr. Cunliffe-Jones's position, which cannot but have impressed itself on all his hearers.

For Mr. Goodall's faultless chairmanship we were all most wonderingly grateful; and I believe that those of us who were present will long remember Mr. Saint's leading of our prayers on the last morning. But why were there so few College dons present? and are there no other Congregationalists under thirty who have an interest in these questions?

The smell of those beggars held on to us as we drove out of that good-for-little town and met again the sand-wastes and hilly places of middle Galilee. It must have been just such howling mobs that pestered Jesus. The disciples must have been a walking, human wall around Him to keep those beggars back. Yet they were the ones He wanted to preach to. They were the ones He fed in the wilderness. It was their blindness He took away, their leprous sores and bloody issues that He healed. What is the matter with us that we forget that? I had squirmed and felt contaminated because they crowded around me and was relieved when we rolled away, lordly in their eyes, although our car was only a hired one and ready to collapse. These wretches were His care but they have not been ours. Why haven't His followers done something for them? Jesus healed, so the scriptures say; He told the disciples they could do likewise, they and all that followed Him. Why, then, are the churches not healing to-day? They can't prohibit disease by law, so what are they doing about it? Money for doctors, hospitals, nurses, sanitation? That is no answer to such a duty. The atheists also contribute to that, the Jews, too, and the unbelievers. Your Church, my brothers and sisters in Christ, was founded on the healing ministry of the Master. He even raised the dead from their graves. I am willing to say to you that I can believe He did all these miracles, if you will explain to me why you do not perform them to-day. He commanded you to do so! Is it because you don't really believe that such miracles can be performed? Or is it that there are no honest-to-Christ Christians left in the world, no real followers of this Man whose very presence seems to me to become actual as I roll here on soft tyres over the roads that bruised His feet. Why do not the followers of Jesus cure blindness, deafness, lameness and madness? You have ducked that question, most of you, for centuries—you Latins, Greeks, Copts, Armenians, and you Protestants who brought me up—except that here and there a few literal Christians appeared among you and those you generally locked hastily away in either an asylum or a bishop's robe.

All but one of you sects are guilty of denying your Leader. The Christian Science Church—and I honour it in spite of its fanciful theories—has made healing the corner-stone of its faith. Just as did the disciples of Jesus. To a lesser extent some of the Fundamentalists and even the Episcopalians practise healing. Many psychologists and pathologists are busy trying to explain the existence of these few consistent congregations. Yet, somehow, I feel that even these Christian Scientists are still on the wrong track. Their practitioners do heal. But they charge for it. Jesus never did. But, to be fair, He did say the labourer was worthy of his hire. Only, Christ was not a hired man.

FULTON OURSLER, *A Sceptic in the Holy Land.*

So far we have seen how futile and hopeless was the Christian imitation of Moslem methods and how the Crusades, after costing untold suffering and enormous loss of life, actually accomplished nothing. In the end Islam prevailed because the sword can never be a successful weapon in the spread of Christianity. In all these studies at each period of history this lesson more than any other has been emphasized. The use of the sword, whether by the Byzantines of Constantinople or by the Popes of Rome, has brought nothing but disaster to the Church. The sword and Christianity are incompatible because Christ is the Prince of Peace. The sword and Islam have

ever gone together and harmonized because Mohammed accepted the sword as the instrument of Islamic expansion. The difference between the two faiths is as fundamental as the gulf between the characters of Christ and Mohammed. The invasion of the world by an Arab army marks the policy of the one and the Cross of Calvary that of the other. Because the Church so signally failed to understand the meaning of the Cross it succumbed to a stronger force.

W. Wilson Cash, *Christendom and Islam.*

My Jesus is not yours, or yours. To each his own Christ, as to each his own landscape. The Judge, the Saviour, the King, the Teacher, the Physician, the Master—all these have been found, and legitimately found, in these brief Gospel pages; let Christian art through the centuries bear witness. In these last days, curiously enough, it is not only the Master who emerges, but the Comrade—the vivid, the human Christ as the disciples knew Him before Calvary. It is not given to all disciples to say with Thomas, "My Lord and my God". But all without exception unite in that other response: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life".

Vida D. Scudder, *On Journey.*

But there are grave limits to the effectiveness of the best and most forcible methods of restraint. No fences or parapets built around a youth will ever form in him a spirit devoted to a life of positive goodness. We must pass over "the great divide" from negation to affirmation, from "Don't" to "I am highly resolved". "I wish *no* was a swear word, mamma", a little boy said, "for then you wouldn't say it". There is a powerful parable in our Gospels of a life "empty, swept, and garnished", which very quickly becomes filled with seven times as many "suggestions" to evil as was the case before it was emptied. There is no "safety" until the right interests are formed and the right desires are created.

Rufus M. Jones, *Some Problems of Life.*

"But wait a minute", said Algernon. "Do you mean to say that that was the deliberate purpose of the policy? That all that happened was intended to happen?"

"Oh, dear, me, no", said Dr. Jenkins. "In the City nothing ever happens intentionally. People there are not up to having intentions. You hear a lot of talk about the machiavellian plans of international financiers, but in truth, if you can find any of them who has got as far as knowing that twice two makes four and how to dial a telephone, you can count yourself as lucky. Now, if you remember, when we went off the gold standard, nobody in the city had the least notion what was going to happen, whether about Indian investments or anything else. A few odd clergymen and Dons and strays like that knew, but not people in the City".

Christopher Hollis, *We Aren't So Dumb.*

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Jesus der Weltvollender Der Glaube an die Versöhnung und Weltverwandlung. Von KARL HEIM. Berlin: Furche-Verlag. RM.5.80.

Jesus the World-Perfecter, Faith in Reconciliation and World-Transformation is the third volume of Karl Heim's great work, *The Evangelical Faith and the Thought of the Present.* The first volume of this, *Faith and Thought (Glaube und Denken),* published in 1931, was written before the Nazis came into power, and sought to show to a Germany that had no authoritative world-view that Christianity, and Christianity alone, could bring deliverance from the lassitude of scepticism. When the Nazis came into power, Germany once more had a world-view eagerly held and passionately proclaimed. Instead of the denial of God, there was the affirmation of God, but the God of race and blood, not the God of revelation. Heim tried to meet the new situation in his radical revision of his first volume, the English translation of which is called *God the Transcendent.* The second volume, *Jesus the Lord,* published in 1935, presented Jesus as the Leader (*der Führer*), commanding an allegiance more absolute than *der Führer* in Germany or *il duce* in Italy can claim. We have already in these columns described the contents of these books, and expressed our great appreciation of them.

Christian theology has as its central theme the Work of Christ, and we have eagerly awaited the publication of this third volume. We confess we have read it with some misgiving and with disappointment—misgiving because this book illustrates how great is the gulf which separates even so deeply Christian a German as Karl Heim from Christians of other lands, and disappointment because the chief emphasis in its treatment of Christ's Work is laid on an interpretation of it which, whether true or false, is remote from knowledge and experience. It is an ominous reflection of the present mood of Germany that even a book on the Work of Christ should bristle with the metaphors of war, whilst, when Heim wishes to illustrate the Satanic nature of sin, it is usually of the sins of Communists that he speaks.

The first section of the book is entitled "Presuppositions for the Understanding of the Message of the Reconciliation and Perfecting of the World". In it he deals with "God and Guilt", "Guilt and Fate", and "The Question of Guilt and Power". Much in these sections is pertinent and suggestive. Rightly he argues that the man who thinks only of power "mistakes the deepest roots of genuine power". But his illustration from the Great War shows a lack of moral insight:

> Only "with the light storm-pack of a good conscience" can men go gladly to death. They require the certainty that Hindenburg sincerely held in the critical hours of the World-War: We fight for our good right, we die for the just cause of a people attacked. As soon as this certainty is lost, or even injured, the power of an army is weakened. That was shown, *e.g.*, at the end of the World-War, when a conscience-less agitation succeeded in producing in a part of the army doubt as to the justice of the German cause and to create the impression: We are fighting for the interests of the great industries; we are sent to death to increase the profits of capitalism .

Scruples do, indeed, lessen strength for conflict, but a good conscience may merely be a sign of insensitiveness to moral issues. War-makers would be less dangerous had they less easy consciences. As Heim says,

when speaking of the Soviet Government, "the weakness which comes from severance from God, the source of all power", can become "of Satanic strength". Surely it is wiser to recognize that for ourselves, as for our enemies, absence of scruple is no proof of the justice of our cause. Strong men with "good consciences" have been, and are, the bane of our race.

The last section of this, the first part of the book, deals with World-Reconciliation and World-Perfecting. Heim writes:

> The conflict in regard to Christ which to-day has flared up anew is not in the last resort whether we can admire Christ as a nordic hero, or whether for us the dead of the World-War and the men who carried the banners of the national revolution, stand higher than He from the point of view of the German ideal of the hero. Jesus claims for Himself no human heroism. He did not come to gather to Himself a crowd of admirers, as human heroes have been able to do; He came, moreover, to fulfil a task of which no human hero is capable . . . He came to lift the burden which presses on the world in the abysmal depth of its separation from God.

The second part of the book is entitled "The Reconciler". Jesus came not to the "strong", but to the men to whom Luther's words apply: "He alone can truly pray, who is truly terrified". "Only for a small circle of men is the problem of guilt the central problem of human life. For others the New Testament message of Christ is unintelligible".

In recent years there has been a new appreciation of the element of truth contained in the Patristic interpretation of Christ's work as a victory over the Devil, and some of us have sought to combine this element of truth with the truths expressed in the other great types of interpretation of Christ's work. Heim sees in this victory over the Devil the decisive factor in Christ's work, and speaks of the existence of the Devil with surprising confidence. In German fashion, he expresses himself by an "either—or":

> Either the Satanic power which opposes God along the whole front is a reality, or, what Christ and under His guidance the first Christians have said of Satan is delusion and mythology.

He admits that we can never explore "the depths of Satan". That there should be in a world in which

> God does all, a will which seeks to destroy God, is a Gordian knot we cannot unravel . . . We are compelled to accept two propositions we can never reconcile. The one is: God is and even in the Devil He alone works. Without this certainty we could not pray nor trust in God; without this, God's power would be limited by a counter-power into whose hands we might at any moment fall. The other is: God has no part in the diabolical resistance, for, if God Himself shared in the Devil's qualities, He could not hold us responsible if we take part in the demonic insurrection.

Both propositions must be retained. "We feel the inexhaustible depths of God and the depths of Satan."

Heim rejects altogether the modern interpretation of Christ's death as the love of the Son, showing itself in suffering and in the forgiveness of His enemies. That, he says, is not unique, and to prove this gives two illustrations, one from a Buddhist myth, the other from the dying words of "Sir Roger Casement, the martyr for the freedom of Ireland". Instead, he interprets Christ's work solely as the conflict with the Prince of this world. His death was substitutionary, for "what He did was something

we could not do". What He did was, in God's behalf, to overcome the Devil's power and release us from his curse.

Heim then seeks to show that it is impossible to limit the mission of Jesus to His work of reconciliation. Jesus was not concerned only with the saving of individuals, but with the complete destruction of the Devil's power. "An end must be when God shall, indeed, be all in all. . . . There is no genuine faith in God without an expectation of the end." Already in the Resurrection of Christ the End has broken through:

> The Resurrection of Christ is the irruption of the new creation of the world, which is only interrupted for a definite time through the pause in creation in which we now stand, before it comes fully to completion . . . Will that Restoration of the world mean our salvation? That we cannot conclude from God's all-power and love.
>
> Logically from God's holiness and our guilt, it would only follow that we all are lost. We all have earned eternal damnation. It remains always inconceivable if we are saved. Thus it is perhaps a holy ordinance of God that we, in regard to this last question, during all our life on earth must remain in trembling uncertainty. But Jesus does not lift the veil. We must consent to remain in darkness.

The last section of the book deals with the Church of Christ, whose work belongs to this intermediate period before the powers of Satan, already overcome, are fully destroyed. Christ is already perfected; we are in this transition-time between reconciliation and perfection. We can serve Him, knowing that He is able to carry out His plan.

This book is the poignant confession of faith of one of the greatest teachers of the modern Church, to whose earlier books some of us are deeply indebted. Heim can rightly claim support for its teaching in some sayings of the Gospels and of St. Paul, and from the whole book of the *Revelation,* whilst Luther, whom Lutherans quote as if he had canonical authority, wrote often in this strain. But we cannot feel that Christian faith is merely, as Luther put it, "comforted despair". We have often protested against the tendency in this country to reduce Christianity to the following of the "Jesus of History". But in Heim the reaction against the over-emphasis on the "Jesus of History" has surely gone too far. It is the living Christ we trust, but that living Christ would be to us the unknown had we not seen Him, and so the nature of God's love, in the historic Jesus. We dare not deny the existence of Satan and of demons, yet at the same time we dare not speak of them with Heim's confidence. Human sin, our sin, the sin of nations, of the past and present, that we know, and it is wiser to seek to relate Christ's work to that sin than to speak of a conflict with Satan remote from our responsibility and knowledge. As Heim himself admits, the Christianity he proclaims has only a message for the few to whom the problem of guilt is the one problem of life. The problem of guilt is, indeed, the gravest of all problems. Yet our Lord could bring comfort to the sad and the sick, and could share in the joy of the happy. We hope this last book of Heim will be translated, for all that he writes demands the most serious consideration, but we cannot feel that Heim's interpretation of Christ's work is adequate. The Christian message includes the hope of the completion of Christ's victory, but our share in that hope is itself dependent on our present experience of His work of revelation and reconciliation.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Werdendes Quäkertum, by Dr. Theodor Sippell (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, RM.13.50). We have here an original and illuminating study of Quakerism in its chrysalis stage, or (to use a more congenial metaphor) of

the smouldering piles which, when Fox applied the match, caught flame and fused into Quakerism. The author is the chief, one might say the only, German authority on Puritanism, and should be known for his previous studies of Quakerism, a pamphlet on William Dell, and articles on the Congregationalists and other sects in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. To attempt the disentanglement of the religious movements of the years 1620-1650, with their complicated interactions, is a serious task, and the present work, though small, is the fruit of many years' thought and research. In it Dr. Sippell traces the breakdown of Calvinistic Puritanism into various more radical, individualistic movements. Apart from the wave of Arminianism in the Church of England, which he merely mentions, he describes on the one hand the pantheistic mysticism of John Everard (whom he not unjustly regards as his own discovery, and in whom he finds a pupil of Nicholas of Cusa), and on the other the chiliastic enthusiasm and antinomianism of the "Saints" in the army. William Dell is taken as representative of the "Saints", and to the influence of the earlier Luther upon him, already traced in the pamphlet mentioned, is now added that of Schwenckfeld. Another spiritual enthusiast, also influenced by Luther, was Roger Brerely, for whose antinomianism Dr. Sippell refers to his earlier work; Brerely's followers, the Grindletonians, prepared the way for the Seekers in the North-West, which became the birthplace and headquarters of Quakerism. A third movement towards a more radical position is typified by Roger Williams, who, like so many others, was driven by his conscience through various denominations, till he became a spiritual solitary; Dr. Sippell has already indicated a connexion between the Grindletonians and Williams through Mrs. Hutchinson. The Ranters, as represented by Bauthumley, find their place among the mystics; and in the Levellers Dr. Sippell sees an illuminating parallel to the Quakers, in that both were primarily struggling for individual rights, but the Levellers' concern was purely secular, while the Quakers' was purely spiritual.

Mysticism, chiliastic enthusiasm, antinomianism, and spiritual radicalism were from their different sides all working towards an unecclesiastic individualism of the Seeker type; in the Quaker movement which was soon to sweep the country they fused. Their fusion is the more interesting in that the mystical and the prophetic approaches are so different, indeed it would seem incompatible: the tension between them is here excellently sketched. In the last chapter Dr. Sippell presents the burning ethical earnestness which gave George Fox's personality its unifying power, and finds in its concern for *witness* the essence and the importance of Quakerism. German translations of Puritan works of necessity take up much of the text, but the appendix containing passages in English is more than half of the book; the relation of these passages to the text might have been made clearer.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Reformation, The Mass, and The Priesthood. By ERNEST C. MESSENGER, Ph.D. Longmans. Vol. I. The Revolt from the Medieval Church. 18s. Vol. II. Rome and the Revolted Church. 30s.

This massive Roman Catholic work of nearly 1,400 pages, described as "A Documental History with special reference to the question of Anglican Orders", will long be a book of reference on the vexed problem with which it deals. Realizing that varying views of the nature of the Eucharist, and indeed of the Church, lie at the root of the matter, Dr. Messenger's survey goes back to the beginnings, and sets out first what he considers to be the Scriptural and Patristic doctrine of the Eucharist and the Priesthood. He then describes the specific ideas and doctrines rejected at the Reformation, denies (*pace* Mr. Belloc) that Henry VIII was orthodox save for denial of the Papal Supremacy, and argues—here earning the wrath of Anglo-Catholics—that

> the Anglican Reformation was carried out with the assistance and advice of the Continental Reformers, and followed a precisely similar plan. The Catholic doctrinal standard was abolished and replaced by new Protestant doctrines from abroad. A new liturgy was also introduced, in harmony with the new doctrines. In particular, the Catholic doctrines of the Real Objective Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass were abandoned, and new Communion services drawn up to express the new Protestant conceptions. The conception of the ministry underwent a corresponding change, which was in turn expressed in a new ordination rite, just as had been done abroad.

Further, Elizabeth introduced

> an ordination rite which had been categorically condemned both by the English Catholic Bishops, and by the Holy See itself.

The discussions down to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* are then outlined, and the recent recognition of Anglican Orders by the Old Catholics and the Orthodox Church discussed. In the Preface and Appendix to Vol. II Dr. Messenger replies to criticisms of Vol. I.

The impression we have so far received from these two volumes—final judgment must be suspended until they have been more fully used—is that Dr. Messenger has put an immense amount of work into his study, and that from his own side he knows his subject very well. We are struck, however, by the fact that his glances at the other side of the picture, especially the Puritans, are superficial, and in general Dr. Messenger seems to have consulted the printed material but rarely to have gone any deeper. This must not give the impression that his book is not extremely valuable. We know no place, *e.g.*, where the relationship between the English and Continental Protestantism of the 16th century is so thoroughly discussed. EDITOR.

Ezekiel. By G. A. Cooke. Clark. 20s.

The new "International Critical Commentary" on *Ezekiel* by Dr. G. A. Cooke, until recently the Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, represents Biblical scholarship at its best. This scholarship is devoted, in painstaking detail, to the elucidation of a prophet who does not greatly attract the ordinary reader of the Old Testament, partly because of the subject-matter, and partly because the original text has not been well preserved. There was all the more need for a full-size commentary on it; hitherto the English student has been without such help, though the "Cambridge Bible" (Davidson) and the "Century Bible" (Lofthouse) have been very useful within their much more limited scope. In recent times there has been considerable discussion of *Ezekiel,* and the earlier acceptance of its (practically) unbroken unity has been challenged in various ways. It has been suggested that Ezekiel, later in life, worked over his own earlier prophecies (Herrmann) or that the original "Ezekiel" is the author of a few poems only in the book, the prose (of which the greater part consists) being added a century or two later (Hölscher), or that a priestly writer of the third century wrote as if he were a prophet amid the pagan reaction under Manasseh in the seventh century, whilst another writer adjusted this work to the supposed conditions of the Babylonian exile (Torrey), or that a North Israelite actually wrote the book in Manasseh's time (J. Smith), or that prophecies spoken in Jerusalem were put into a Babylonian framework by an exilic editor, apart from the post-exilic conclusion of Cc. XLff. (Herntrich). Dr. Cooke has considered all these theories and finds them unnecessary to explain the peculiarities of the book. He emphasizes the obvious complexity of this prophetic personality as the explanation of the changes of outlook which puzzle the thoughtful reader. In this we think he is right. Substantially, he holds, the book was the work of one man, living and writing in Babylon, as had previously been believed. But he recognizes, with many other scholars who share this more conservative view, that there have been extensive later additions to the last portion of the book (which describes the future temple), and he also, with many others, regards the two apocalyptic chapters (38 and 39) as a later composition. He seems unduly reluctant to admit a "pathological" element in the prophet; the analogy of Blake and not a few others suggests that genius may pay this price for its special qualities, without necessary detriment to the result. But he accepts the abnormality of "second sight", and recognizes the performance of "symbolic acts" by this prophet to a degree that belongs to him alone.

The "high lights" of the book, whether from a purely literary or a theological standpoint, are clearly brought out, though with restraint and great brevity. It may safely be said that this commentary will dominate the interpretation of *Ezekiel* for many years to come—as many as have gone to its making. This will not be, of course, through popular use of the commentary, but through its influence on the minority which can bring the conclusions of its scholarship into wider circles. Every serious student of *Ezekiel,* but most of all those who can follow (with such help) the Hebrew text, will be grateful to author and publishers for this book.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Life of Jesus. By Conrad Noel. Dent. 12s. 6d.

This seems to us to be a noble perhaps even an epoch-making book. Many lives are written, but this has at least the merit of being entirely different from them all. So rare the candour, so daring the originality, so wide the reading, so closely woven the argument, so intense the enthusiasm and so passionate the conviction with which this book is written that

amazed and astonished the reader is constrained more than once to put it down with a wild surmise. The Archbishop of Armagh had told us that the gospel must always be news. This is stop-press news with a vengeance, urgent, compelling, thrilling, a story we have never heard before, a Christ we have never seen, a Jesus who transcends all our accepted creeds and shatters all our familiar moulds. The message of this book will cast fire in study and street, moving men to indignant denial or else to passionate assent. In these pages we find the pietists and the pacifists equally challenged and their respective interpretations of the gospel equally refuted. This Jesus is neither the Saviour of the souls of individual men by the shedding of His precious blood nor a sentimental idealist refraining from all employment of arms because they hurt, wound, and kill. This Christ, indeed, disdains the method of force but chiefly because it is futile and inadequate rather than because it is wrong. And the Kingdom which He proclaims is to be established here upon earth, a solid, tangible new world-order, a matter of economics, politics, and justice. This Christ is a rebel. Against the amoral might of Rome and the sycophantic time-serving of the Jewish magnates we see Jesus driving with a relentless, divine fury. The two swords of the last evening are serious; daggers to arm the man on either side of him—a bodyguard against treacherous attack by assassins in the night. And the inspiration of this brave new world was found in the ancient faith of Israel truly interpreted, justice among men.

Mr. Conrad Noel's study is as comprehensive as it is intense. To support his reading of the mystery of the Christ a careful review of the social and political background is given. The book is in three parts. In the first part the fascist *régime* of ancient Rome, its wealth, its slavery, its imperialism and its brutality is dealt with—perhaps exposed would be the better word—exceedingly faithfully. Under this candid treatment how different the Roman Empire, applauded of bourgeois dons and schoolmasters, is made to appear! Then follows, as Part II, a longer section called "The Kingdom of Heaven". Under this unexpected title we are given a penetrating review of the old dispensation, the economics of Moses, and the stern justice demanded by the Law, the frequency of subsequent denial and oblivion of it, the vehemence of prophetic recall, the collapse of the Jewish state at the touch of the River Empires, the Maccabean revival, and so on towards the great climax.

Part III is "The Advent of the Messiah". From out the Redemptionist group comes John the Leveller, a fierce preacher of the ancient justice, fearless, direct, sensational. Kings being what they are, this leveller is soon removed, whereupon Jesus assumes the leadership of the growing revolution. There follows no fantastic sketch of the divine ministry twisted to fit into the author's wishes, imaginative, personal, unconvincing. Far from it. The gospel text is closely and faithfully followed. *John,* admitted as an historic record, is woven in with the Synoptics and the portrait is in every detail loyal to the sources. Especially noteworthy are the two chapters on the Temptation. In such a society and under such government to proclaim and work towards the establishment of a new order of equality, fair-play, and justice could, of course, meet with but one end. Jesus knows it from the first. His one anxiety is to sow the seed adequately before He is Himself removed from the scene. Hence His frequent flights from the craft of the Pharisees until the time is ripe. Then, entirely fearless, He advances upon the capital. There follows the crucifixion, the mighty resurrection, and the glorious ascension.

Neither pietist, pacifist, fundamentalist, modernist, catholic, nor Protestant will be fully satisfied. This mighty Christ transcends and

dwarfs the smaller and safer creeds of them all. A profound and serious study, this book is also a tract for the times, our times. Mr. Noel, absorbed in ancient Rome and ancient Palestine, never for one moment seems to forget modern Europe. With the inspired fervour of a prophet he preaches a Christ most relevant to our present needs and condition. And the best or worst of it is that as we read on fascinated, there begins to be born in our hearts the trembling yet tremendous conviction that Mr. Noel is right. It may well be that this study of the age-long mystery of the Christ penetrates nearer to the truth than most. "If", says the author in his introduction, "it does provoke the public, I hope it will not provoke them to fury but to thought". It cannot fail to do so.

D. W. Langridge.

Christianity, Communism and the Ideal Society. By James Feibleman. Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Believing that some kind of synthesis of Christianity and Communism is possible and will in fact be the faith of the future, many people regret both the truculent atheism of present day Russia and the frequency of anti-communist Christian polemic. They feel that there is much in Communism that is essentially Christian and so they deplore the conflict between "the declining world-system of Christianity and the rapidly rising world-system of Communism". The possibility of some such fusion of existing beliefs to form the ideal society of the future is the subject matter of this timely volume. The treatment is certainly not of a popular order; the book is a philosophical treatise delving deep into the roots of things; critical, negative, and polemical in spirit. Christianity as a system is historically reviewed and critically assessed. The outworn and valueless elements in it are the Church as an institution, prayer as supplication, the transcendence of God; worthy of retention are the emphasis on the supreme worth of the individual, the freedom and sovereignty of reason, and the preference for persuasion rather than force. There follows a similar critical sifting of Communism. The propaganda of hatred and the dogma of dialectical materialism are to be abandoned and its realism and belief in society as the goal of the individual retained. Then we are given a sketch of a possible ideal society, the unlimited community of the future compounded of elements retained from these great rivals of the present time. In a final word Fascism, Communism, and Democracy as we know them are considered as possible points of departure for the new society of the future.

D. W. Langridge.

The Forgiveness of Sins. By E. Basil Redlich, B.D. Clark. 10s. 6d.

Canon Redlich tells us in his preface that he was moved to write this book by a passage in Archbishop Temple's *Christ's Revelation of God*, where he read:

> It is often said that Our Lord's doctrine is that of free forgiveness on the sole condition of repentance; . . . But there is a condition that we must fulfil if we are to make our own the forgiveness which God always and freely offers. And it is noticeable that repentance is not, in fact, mentioned in this connection. The one thing that is mentioned, and that with a most solemn reiteration, is our forgiveness of those who have injured us or are in our debt.

Stimulated by these words, Canon Redlich has pursued the subject of forgiveness both in the Bible and in Church history down to the composition of the *Book of Common Prayer*. After discussing the gradual development of the doctrine of the Divine forgiveness in the *O.T.* he treats very fully of our Lord's own teaching on the subject, where he finds it so

strongly emphasized that to be forgiven our trespasses against God, we must forgive those who trespass against us.

Here an occasion is found for criticizing a too one-sided reliance upon the parable of the Prodigal Son for an account of the Divine forgiveness. On the basis of this parable repentance is generally defined as a change of attitude towards God. It is in opposition to the notion that this kind of repentance is the sole condition of forgiveness that Canon Redlich writes. He says that indeed this notion is not the true conception of repentance, which is really *metanoia,* a change of mind, which must for a Christian involve both love for God and love for man. He admits that if repentance were properly defined, there would be only *one* condition for forgiveness. But he seems to despair of altering the common idea of repentance, and so prefers, like the Archbishop of York, to insist on forgivingness as an additional condition of forgiveness.

What is to be said as to this contention? There is no doubt that the Archbishop and Canon Redlich are materially right. But it seems unsatisfactory to acquiesce in a definition of repentance which, however usual, is admittedly wrong; a better way would surely be to try to correct the common notion of repentance so as to give the word its full value. As a matter of fact, that is being done by New Testament theologians at the present moment—no doubt in time their work will percolate through to the general public, and the notion of repentance will gradually be altered by it. Indeed it is being altered—many people now know that *metanoia* means a change of mind, and understand repentance, its English equivalent, as including both love for God and love for man.

In the Church-History part of the book Canon Redlich discusses especially the growth of the system of penance as a method of bringing the Divine forgiveness into effect after baptism. It was the common view in the ancient Church that there took place at baptism a great forgiveness of all pre-baptismal sin. The question then arose, what was to be said of sin after baptism. The extreme rigorist view was that there could be no forgiveness after baptism; a modified form of it allowed one such forgiveness. But both the extreme and the modified rigorism were abandoned, and forgiveness after baptism was organized as an institution of penance, in which confession of sin was made, and satisfaction was done. Here Canon Redlich shows how in the Middle Ages confession to a priest became universally compulsory; while the idea that the priest declares the Divine forgiveness hardened into a doctrine of the judicial power of the priest to absolve in virtue of his office. Canon Redlich regards both these developments as corruptions of the proper notion of forgiveness, and he would interpret the *Book of Common Prayer* in this sense. While Anglo-Catholics from Newman onwards have insisted on the retention of the medieval judicial form of absolution in the office for the Visitation of the Sick, Canon Redlich regards this as no more than a survival from the past, not to be taken as a basis of doctrine, but rather to be interpreted according to the general tenor of the *Prayer Book* as Protestant and Evangelical and as using elsewhere the declaratory form of absolution.

Free Churchmen can only wish well to Canon Redlich's intention; but it would be much more satisfactory if next time the *Prayer Book* is revised the revision were to take place with an Evangelical tendency, and not as last time in an Anglo-Catholic direction: then the judicial form of absolution might disappear altogether. That, of course, would imply a great increase of Evangelical influence in the Church of England, a consummation devoutly to be wished. Reunion with the Free Churches would then be in sight, as it is not at present.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Gnosis or Ancient Wisdom in the Christian Scriptures. By WILLIAM KINGSLAND. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

The purpose of this book is to explain the *N.T.* as one among the many different forms in which there is taught, for those who can penetrate through the husk to the kernel, an ancient gnosis, as old as the hills, which tells of the descent of the soul from God into matter and the return of the soul to God through its own recognition of its divine nature. It is understood that the name God here stands not for the personal Deity of common Christian faith, but for the Ineffable Absolute, which can only be described in negative terms. In a word, the book renews in a modern setting the doctrine and the endeavour of the Neoplatonists, who saw in their religious philosophy the esoteric meaning of all the various religions. Mr. Kingsland sets side by side with Christianity with the same purpose many other religions, ancient and modern—Egyptian, Indian, Persian, and so on. He brings in also to support his argument the Gnostics of the second century, various Christian Fathers and theologians, and above all all those mystics from Eckhart and Boehme to William James and Evelyn Underhill, who have converged from a Christian starting-point towards his position.

Now it is a fact that Christianity in its effort to understand itself and to maintain itself in a civilized world has often resorted to an alliance with Neoplatonism, sometimes strictly limited, sometimes almost unlimited. The names of Origen, Augustine, the Cambridge Platonists, and Dean Inge all occur to the mind. Moreover, the Logos doctrine of the *N.T.*, incipient in St. Paul's Epistles, further developed in *Hebrews* and culminating in the Fourth Gospel, has undoubted affinities with Neoplatonism. It is a fact also that the Gnostics, whom the Church rejected in the second century, represent a onesided development of Paulinism—they did but carry to the extreme ideas traceable in the *N.T.*, only rejecting other things there written which neutralized any danger there might be in such ideas.

What was it that the early Gnostics rejected and the Church maintained? It was the *O.T.*, with its God who is a personal Will, and no mere abyss of negations in which the mind is lost. Mr. Kingsland attacks the Jahweh of the *O.T.* as crudely anthropomorphic—he has put his finger unerringly upon the point where he and the most modernist of Christians must ultimately diverge. Not that, as instructed by our *O.T.* scholars, we need to affirm all that is said of Jahweh as of permanent worth. But God's personality and will, as further disclosed by the great prophets, are the absolute foundation of the Christian religion. Mr. Kingsland says that Jesus

> in using the term Father simply endeavoured to bring down the conception of the ONE (God) with whom he had realized his oneness, to the level of his Jewish hearers, since the Jews had been accustomed to think of God as a *person*—and a very human one at that.

But we have not so learned Christ—Jesus Himself stood in the line of the *O.T.* Prophets, in the same personal communion with a personal God, as they did. It is an adherence to the prophets in the *O.T.* and to the Synoptic Jesus in the *N.T.* as the very bases of our religion that must prevent us from ever allowing Pauline or Johannine Christianity from being transformed into a Neoplatonic Gnosis.

Von Hügel in his famous book, *The Mystical Element of Religion,* continually distinguishes between the mysticism (such as that of St. Paul or St. John) which is allowable and commendable in Christianity, and that other mysticism which he calls "pure mysticism", which is always a danger to the Christian religion. Von Hügel was very wise; and there could be no better antidote to Mr. Kingsland's "gnosis" than his great

and learned book, which, recognizing to the full the proper affinity of Christianity with Neoplatonism, yet carefully draws the line between them so as to prevent the special characteristics of the Christian religion being dissipated in a vague mysticism, for which all religions are one. When a similar doctrine was propounded by Schelling, Hegel justly compared it to the night in which all cows are grey. To be quite plain and definite—if God is truly to be Light and not darkness, He must be Love, and Love is essentially personal.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Types of Modern Theology. By H. R. MACKINTOSH. Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

Just before his lamentable death in the summer of last year Prof. H. R. Mackintosh was engaged in revising and expanding his Croall Lectures. The work has now been completed by his friend and colleague, Dr. A. B. Macaulay. The book provides a fitting crown and conclusion to a most notable career. Scotland has given us many leaders in theological thought, but Mackintosh stands out among them conspicuous by the sanity of his judgment, the brilliance of his exposition, and the truly Christian spirit of his work.

After a brief introduction giving the background from which he approaches the modern problem, Mackintosh devotes two long chapters to the epoch-making work of Schleiermacher. He recognizes in Schleiermacher the only great theologian of the nineteenth century and one whose peculiar gift it was "to unite in an exceptional degree the most passionate religion with the unbending rigour of a scientific thinker". At the same time Mackintosh realizes that we are passing out of the era of Schleiermacher's thought and that he has himself emphasized the need for and pointed the way to a theology at once more Christian and more human. In view of the almost savage attacks which are now being made on Schleiermacher by some of the followers of Barth, it is good to have Dr. Mackintosh's quiet and appreciative reminder of the real and great contribution which he has made to modern theology. The defects of his system lie on the surface. A Christian theology that is defective in the treatment of sin and the Person of Jesus Christ undoubtedly needs correcting, but when all allowance has been made for his defects, Schleiermacher undoubtedly stands out as an original and creative thinker.

From the study of the Theology of Feeling which Schleiermacher represents Mackintosh passes to the Theology of Speculative Rationalism as represented by Hegel and the Hegelians. This section of the book includes a brilliant sketch of the negative position represented by Strauss and Feuerbach. Then comes a chapter on Ritschl and the Theology of Moral Values—one of the sanest and most intelligible discussions of Ritschl's position that we have seen. Mackintosh finds a certain analogy between Ritschl and Karl Barth, whom he calls his great successor. He considers that both in their intention and programme these two theologians are much nearer to each other than has often been supposed. The difference between them he puts as follows:

> Ritschl undertakes to furnish a theology inspired throughout by Scripture, but too often fails to keep his promise, whereas Barth is set upon thinking out something that will deserve to be called a "Theology of the Word of God", and has so far proceeded with a consistency and power which is engaging the attention of the whole Christian Church.

From Ritschl Dr. Mackintosh passes on to consider the work of Troeltsch and what he calls the Theology of Scientific Religious History.

This, again, is a most illuminating study and exposition of the work of a thinker who deserves more attention and recognition than he has as yet received. The two last chapters in the book deal with the Theology of Paradox in the person of Sören Kierkegaard and the Theology of the Word of God as expounded by Karl Barth. Mackintosh realizes that there is a very close connexion between Kierkegaard and the movement which Barth represents. His study of Kierkegaard again is a timely and quite original contribution to a very perplexing subject. Kierkegaard is only now coming into his own and it is perhaps too early to form a sound judgment as to the permanence and effectiveness of his work. Dr. Mackintosh considers that he is indeed a prophet and suggests

> that the man who fails to discover in prophets and apostles something of which Kierkegaard's strong words are an index—something real and august at which he is pointing, though with one-sided emphasis—appears to me to read with a veil upon his eyes.

To Barth and his teaching Dr. Mackintosh is somewhat unexpectedly favourable. He recognizes that there has been growth and development in Barth's theology and that some of his earlier positions can no longer be maintained. He also realizes the weakness of Barth's doctrine of humanity and the difficulty of maintaining the absoluteness of the Word in revelation. He very pertinently asks, without attempting to answer, the following questions :

> Is the "giveness" of revelation in Christ quite real and unconditioned if, after all, to be fully realized it must be apprehended by man, even if that apprehension is wrought in us by the Spirit? Is not God's gift of Himself in Christ fully real whether it be received or not?

Mackintosh's general survey and criticism of Barth's position is quite admirable and few will dissent from his conclusion

> that the theology of Barth, criticize it as we may, is the Christian thinking of a great Christian mind, explosive and often unduly emphatic, but none the less of incalculable import to the church of our time.

Enough has been said to show that this last legacy of Dr. Mackintosh to his Church is also of incalculable import. We could imagine no better introduction to the study and understanding of modern theological problems than a book of this kind. We hope it may become a textbook in every theological college and that students may be tempted to pay at least as much attention to the period it covers as they do to the patristic period or the Middle Ages.

W. B. Selbie.

The Philosophical Bases of Theism. By G. Dawes Hicks. Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.

In one of his letters William James writes : "I confess I rather despair of any popular religion of a philosophic character", yet here is Dr. Dawes Hicks giving Hibbert Lectures on the philosophy of religion "designed primarily for the general reader". He argues quite reasonably and forcibly that the philosophical approach to religion is indispensable, and that "a religious mind that understands itself, that is, has reflected on the principles on which its religion rests, is clearly an advance upon the religious mind that has not so reflected".

With the general reader in his mind, therefore, Dr. Hicks begins his lectures by discussing the relation of religion and philosophy and emphasizing the need for a philosophy of religion. He then turns to man's place

in nature and shows the shortcomings of a merely scientific naturalism and of the humanism which is now often taking its place. He gives two lectures on Religious Experience which he defines as follows:

> Religious experience, especially in its mature form, involves all the factors which go to constitute human personality. It rests upon insight and it develops as such insight becomes keener and more comprehensive. It is thus emphatically based on knowledge. It contains likewise the element of feeling, for although there is no such thing as feeling apart from knowing, feeling or emotion is an essential ingredient in the complex experience. And since religious impulses operate as a potent means of inducing men to reach after moral ideals, religious experience leads to the concrete realization in conduct of what the moral imperative enjoins; it involves, that is to say, a fully fashioned will.

Then follows a survey of the various efforts men have made to justify their faith in religion, and we have discussions of the cosmological and teleological arguments, of values and the moral argument, and finally of the ontological argument, leading up to the relations between pantheism and theism. These latter lectures cover a good deal of familiar ground, but Dr. Hicks's treatment even of the most hackneyed subjects is always fresh and original. His lectures are extraordinarily valuable for the trenchant criticism they contain of Humanism on the one hand and Pantheism on the other, for his treatment of religious experience, and his condemnation of the more extreme forms of mysticism. Some readers will no doubt feel that his general attitude is somewhat too subjective and that he allows little or no weight to the belief in revelation. This may or may not be so. The one serious omission in his book is the failure to deal with the problem of evil and with the place of sin in religious experience. Apart from this, however, his quiet and sure handling of the great themes with which he deals and his defence of the position that religion in its highest form rests upon its belief in a supreme living and personal mind, constitute a very notable addition to religious apologetic.

W. B. Selbie.

The Riddle of the World. By D. S. Cairns. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

Dr. Cairns has long been known as a very able and persuasive exponent and defender of the Christian faith. He has the ear of the men and women of the younger generation and can speak to their occasions as few of his contemporaries are able to do. He believes that, if theologians would only take the trouble, they might make their subject intelligible and interesting to a very wide public among the more educated of all classes, and he certainly shows how this can be done in the book now before us.

Its theme is nothing less than the Universe and man's ways of interpreting it. So it deals primarily with

> the broad issue between those who look upon the world as a vast system of Space, Time, and Energy, operating according to uniform law, and those who look upon it teleologically as a creative process realizing spiritual ends of absolute and enduring value, a system, therefore, full of purpose and meaning.

Thus in the first part of the book Dr. Cairns deals faithfully with Humanism and its underlying assumption that science is the only pathway to reality. He then proceeds to vindicate the moral pathway, to defend Natural Theology against the Barthians, and to expound the Christian view of Providence and Revelation. Then follow three great chapters on the

Hebrew Solution—a masterly exposition of that Biblical Theology which Dr. Cairns regards as

> the groundwork of all true theism, the outline and the way in which we must interpret the great riddle of human existence before which so much of the graver thought of our age stands bewildered and dumb.

The whole argument is summed up in a final chapter on "The Substance of the Faith".

The book as a whole is an admirable vindication of the Christian view of the world and of human life. It challenges attention by the breadth of its spirit and the sanity of its outlook. Dr. Cairns is modern without being modernist. He has the courage of his convictions and shirks none of the big issues he raises. His treatment of the problems of evil and sin constitutes a very real Theodicy and shows how it may still be possible to justify the ways of God to man.

W. B. Selbie.

The Psychological Study of Religious Conversion. By W. Lawson Jones. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

As a Methodist Mr. Jones has a natural interest in conversion and in revivalism generally and that is probably his excuse for adding another book on the subject. There is nothing very fresh about his treatment of it, though he does bring into consideration a certain amount of evidence derived from adherence to the Group Movement, and also from a questionnaire of his own and from the testimony of his friends. He draws a sharp, possibly too sharp, distinction between gradual and non-gradual conversion, and provides some interesting statistics as to the frequency of various factors in bringing about a conversion crisis. He makes a great deal of use of the work of American psychologists—Starbuck, Coe, Hall, Leuba, James, and de Sanctis. He shows pretty clearly that conversion is not an exclusively adolescent phenomenon, that sex plays probably less part in it than has sometimes been thought, but that there are marked differences between male and female religious experiences. His book, therefore, gives a very useful survey of the whole subject so far as psychology can throw any light upon it. It shows up both the defects and merits of the psychological method and makes clearer than ever the need for some more strictly theological and philosophical treatment of this great subject. We need something more than psychology to help us to understand the how, why, when, and wherefore of the command "Ye must be born again".

Here and there in the book are some curious lapses. Professor Grenstead (*sic*) is wrongly described as Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford; the higher criticism is said in a note to be "a method of historical interpretation originated by Wellhausen and Baur at Tübingen in the early part of the nineteenth century which has profoundly influenced the English Nonconformist ministry"; Apuleius is constantly spoken of as Apuleias, and Mr. Jones commits himself to the sweeping statement "that in the British Isles the Nonconformist churches are suffering greatly from the consequences of fanatical hostility to culture".

W. B. Selbie.

Personality in Philosophical Theology. By E. G. Braham, D.D. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Braham is the author of a useful book, *Ourselves and Reality*, and he has now followed it up with the present volume, "an attempt to give an historical and critical account of the concept of the Self from Descartes

to Kant, with some reference to immortality". The question of the personality of the soul or self and its relation to mind and body is a very vexed and intricate one. Dr. Braham treats it from a standpoint of his own, for he believes, as against the general trend of idealistic philosophy, that Personality

> is a living active centre participating in the ultimate reality of the Universe which we believe to be a Personal God and is held in unity by the co-ordinating and unifying factor called the pure Ego.

He goes on to argue that it is only possible rightly to evaluate the concept of Personality by a study of the various systems of philosophy and its relation to the general interpretation of life which they give. Hence the present volume.

Dr. Braham begins by going well behind Descartes and treating of Plato, Aristotle, Stoicism, Neo-Platonism, Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas; from Descartes onwards, he deals with the Empiricism of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and the rationalism of Malebranche, Spinoza, and Leibniz, all leading up to the critical philosophy of Kant. This is a portentously wide survey, and some of it at any rate is not altogether relevant to Dr. Braham's main subject, but he does make good his contention that Personality has to be studied in the light of any general philosophy of the Universe which may be set forth. Like so many modern students of philosophical theology, he is very much impressed by Thomas Aquinas, and among his conclusions is the following:

> It may be that the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas where he contends for the uniform reality of the body and soul as constituting the Personality both in this life and the next is the conception which most satisfies common sense, and is the verdict of the self-consciousness of the individual, although we need not accept Aquinas' view of the resurrection of the body in order to believe in some kind of body for the soul which leaves its earthly tenement.

The justification for this conclusion is to be found, of course, in Dr. Braham's whole survey of the subject, which is well worth studying for its own sake.

W. B. Selbie.

Julian the Apostate and the Rise of Christianity: A Study in Cultural History. By F. A. Ridley. Watts. 15s.

This book has been placed by its author safely beyond the reach of ordinary historical criticism. Like the Pope, the Pyramid-measurers, the better-equipped disciples of Marx, and the followers of Pastor Russell, Mr. Ridley enjoys esoteric knowledge. Unlucky persons who do not share it are out of court from the start. "Mere learning", Mr. Ridley tells us, is greatly surpassed by that grasp of "historic dialectics", which alone provides "understanding of the actual processes of history". For this reason the attempts of such scholars as Bury and Prof. Norman Baynes "to rehabilitate the Byzantine Empire" are contemptuously dismissed in footnotes. Such persons may have had "mere learning", but unlike our author they lacked the necessary "grasp of historic dialectics". Because he has that grasp Mr. Ridley can say "It is hardly open to question"; X "has shewn"; "We now know" and so on, where mere scholars have said "It is open to question"; X "has perversely asserted"; "It is far from likely", and so on.

The career of Julian is an interesting subject, and (when he can control his emotion and his grammar) Mr. Ridley is an interesting writer. His thesis is that

> but for a Persian lance the supposedly "inevitable" triumph of Christianity would have been nipped in the bud, and modern Europe, in consequence, would acknowledge Apollo or Odin, and not the Galilean.

For this thesis much can be said by Christians as well as by other men. Whether the course of history is inevitable, what is meant by "inevitable", what would have happened if something else had not happened—these are fascinating problems. They belong perhaps to philosophy rather than to history. Not all Christians assume that there is only one answer to such questions and that a continuation of Julian's life would have made no difference to the fortunes of the Church. Mr. Ridley nevertheless rates and scolds as if all Christians did make those assumptions. "Mere learning" of course, whether pagan or Christian, cannot reveal what would have happened if Julian had lived. That is why Mr. Ridley's esoteric knowledge comes in so usefully. He gibes very properly at "the modern 'historians' who can always foretell the course of history—after it has finished". Mr. Ridley can indeed afford to gibe, for he can foretell even what did not happen.

It has been said that the main use of history is to deliver us from false historical parallels. It appears to be a principal use of "historic dialectics" to provide us with such parallels. Mr. Ridley regards the late Roman Republic and the Empire as a Fascist State which replaced a (somewhat mythical) democracy. Julian he regards as the first exponent of "cultural Bolshevism", who would have exterminated Christianity, as Bolshevism will exterminate it, by the intellectual and educational resources of the totalitarian State rather than by physical force alone. This thesis is repeated in similar (or the same) words many, many times throughout the book. Mr. Ridley will forgive Julian his Fascism for the sake of his anti-Christian enthusiasm. He endeavours to shew that Julian's success would have made for rationalism. To do this he has to skip lightly over the bitter religiosity of Julian, a man full of rancid theology if ever a man was. Indeed, to readers who have only the usual resources of the historian without "historic dialectics" Mr. Ridley's treatment of every important crisis in Julian's career appears as biased as the treatment meted out to Julian by the Christian partisans of whom Mr. Ridley so shrilly complains. It is enough that Constantius was a Christian: against the verdicts of scholars in possession of "mere learning" Mr. Ridley construes every action of his as unfavourably as possible. He does not hesitate, for instance, to attribute to Constantius a design of getting Julian murdered when he made Julian Cæsar and put him in charge of the West. Mr. Ridley has treated the Christians as Dr. Johnson treated the Whigs: he has seen that the dogs have the worst of it. In a man not shielded by "historic dialectics" we should call much of Mr. Ridley's special pleading ignorant or insufferable misrepresentation.

If history must be rewritten in these days in order to discredit the Faith, we sincerely hope that the task will be committed to writers of Mr. Ridley's calibre. The Faith has everything to gain from attacks made by enemies who display so plainly the qualities needed for their reconstruction of history. We have space to mention only two of these qualities. First is the scrupulous inattention to historical accuracy revealed so pleasingly on so many pages of this book. Mr. Ridley attempts to quote the style of the King, and misquotes it. He attempts to quote the Athanasian Creed, and misquotes it. He attempts to transcribe the title of *The Cambridge Medieval History,* and mis-spells it. He attempts to use the words *homoousion* and *homoiousion,* but breaks down in the attempt. To fail

in a mere description of the Godhead is perhaps no great matter, but we should have expected care at least about the name of Julian's own book. Here, however, Mr. Ridley excels even himself. He has produced a howler which merits immortality and puts us in his debt for all time. *The Misopygon* is a delightful title for any book, but alas! not even Julian had the wit to write it. It was to beards, not to buttocks, that he called attention. Small slips, all of these, it may be said. Even if it were so, the accumulation is damaging for a writer who generalizes so confidently and corrects all previous scholars so insolently. Mr. Ridley's ignorance of medieval history appears to be extensive and peculiar. He appears to believe all that the Popes said about Frederick II and to think that the spiritual Franciscans wrote anti-Christian literature.

The second quality which we shall always welcome in writers against the Faith is Mr. Ridley's stuttering and tortuous style. An abandonment of the Galilean error does not suffice to assure the calm classical poise. From the feast of fat things provided it is hard to choose only one example, but this will serve:

> For now the floodgates of bigotry, the arsenals of posthumous ferocity, were at last unleashed, and in the baying and screeching of ecclesiastical fury the world had its first sharp taste of the ocean of bigotry beneath which the humanism and broad tolerance, which were the finest flowers of the old civilization and its most valuable and original gifts to a world which so sadly needed them, were destined to be obliterated for twelve terrible centuries of religious persecution and cultural indifference.

We should be sorry if we might seem to have been unkind to Mr. Ridley. We wish him well, and we believe that with less attention to historic dialectics and more to mere historical learning he will write an attractive book. But people who try to make our flesh creep by an unhappy combination of portentousness and inefficiency must not complain if they are not taken too seriously. Mr. Ridley may mislead those who know less history than he knows, but he will mislead no one else. These are days in which solemn alarmists on all sides warn us of the terrible attacks now being delivered on the Faith. Some attacks—the physical attacks in Russia and Germany—are indeed terrible. But it is good to remind ourselves of the contemptible feebleness of much of the intellectual attack. The unregenerate Christian is entitled to get entertainment from the antics of Goliath, to thank God, and to take courage.

B. L. Manning.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

Though we have the usual sneer at missionaries, contempt for theologians, and the arrogant dismissal of the doctrine of the Atonement, Mr. Fulton Oursler's *A Sceptic in the Holy Land* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) is well worth reading. Mr. Oursler went with his wife and family to Palestine; he had long ceased to believe, but the land brought to him conviction that the life and teaching of Jesus were something of tremendous importance to the world. Those who have been over the ground will understand Mr. Oursler's experience; sometimes he is flippant and irritating; at others he writes not merely trenchantly, but with insight and understanding.

Although Father C. C. Martindale's *Does God Matter for Men?* in the "Needs of To-day" series (Rich & Cowan, 3s. 6d.) is occasionally cheap

and once or twice nasty (when was the Established Church "attacked by Nonconformists, savagely jealous of its social eminence"?) and always Roman, it ought nevertheless to be read, especially by those who have to be Christian apologists. For much of the way the reader will find that he can go with Father Martindale, who always wields a lively pen.

Principal John Dickie came from New Zealand to deliver the Gunning Lectures at New College, Edinburgh, and they are now printed in *Fifty Years of British Theology* (Clark, 3s.). They are full of interest, though the sub-title, "A Personal Retrospect", rightly suggests that the treatment is selective and subjective. We have Newman, Martineau, Westcott, Fairbairn, Flint (Dr. Dickie's great hero), then chapters on "The Reaction to German Theology (especially in Scotland)", and on other theologians. Dale gets only a few lines, and there is no mention of Dr. R. S. Franks in the section on the Atonement. Dr. Dickie, however, has much to teach us, and his final summary deserves careful study.

The Parish Communion (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.), a volume of Anglo-Catholic essays edited by Father A. G. Hebert, contains much valuable material of a kind not suggested in the title. Those engaged in current discussions about the nature of the Church and the necessity of Sacraments should by no means overlook these essays. The book has one main practical purpose, to urge the establishment of a parish communion, taken fasting, and followed by a parish breakfast. The breakfast is held not for convenience, but as

> the social counterpart of the solemn spiritual meal in which the family has partaken. As such it is definitely a social obligation, for it is an organized social event for the purpose of carrying out into social spheres that which has been offered by the family at the altar. In it there must be an atmosphere which breathes the very spirit of the Communion. It is indeed an Agape, a love-feast of those who together have feasted on Christ.

In many parishes the Agape has built up a real Christian fellowship, one lady testifying that

> through this congregational breakfast she had come to realize better in three weeks' time a genuine fellowship with the other members of the congregation than she had been able to do during four years' regular attendance at another church.

It has its dangers, however, for

> there are priests to be found who will almost claim that it is not merely of the *bene esse* but of the *esse* of parish life.

Four more volumes in the pleasing and timely "Christian Challenge" series (Unicorn Press, 3s. 6d. each) have been issued. They are the Rev. L. S. Thornton's *The Doctrine of the Atonement*; Dr. H. P. Newsholme's *Christian Ethics and Social Health;* Dr. E. G. Selwyn's *History of Christian Thought* (to which the Revs. Gregory Dix, F. Tindall, G. W. O. Addleshaw, and H. Balmforth, Profs. A. A. Cock and Hermann Sasse, and Mr. E. H. Blakeney also contribute); and Dr. H. M. Relton's *Religion and the State,* in which we wish we had more of the writer's forceful opinions (as on the last page) and not so much of other people's.

With ingenuity only equalled by his persistence Mr. L. Gordon Rylands continues to argue that Jesus was not an historical person. His new booklet **The Christian Tradition* (Watts, 1s.) should not be despised by believers in Christianity; while it illustrates how it is always possible to find

evidence to support a theory, it will nevertheless provide both useful mental exercise and spiritual discipline.

Miss L. V. Hodgkin's *Day-Book of Counsel and Comfort* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) contains an extract from the letters of George Fox for every day of the year. The letters are in the main addressed not to individuals, but to groups of Friends—at home, in the New England plantations, the West Indies, and on the Continent, sometimes to those in prison or captive in Algiers. They do not deal so much with personal problems as do, say, Wesley's letters, but are rather exhortations to Friends to be faithful to their principles. The focal expressions of Quaker teaching are common—light, life, power, seed, "that of God in everyone", "a-top of the world". Naturally there is a good deal of repetition, and the historian will long for facts in vain : he will learn of 1,300 or 1,400 Quakers in prison in 1683, and glean a few other facts, but not many. But there is much that is timeless in the teaching, as, for example :

> Ye that dwell in the Light, and walk in the Light, use Plainness of Speech, and plain Words, single Words in the single Life, pure Words from the pure Life, seasoned Words, seasoned with Grace. . . .

The editorial work is well done : we think on p. 260 the *sic* should follow "bears" and not "suffer".

The Church and Its Functions in Society (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), prepared for the Oxford Conference by Drs. J. H. Oldham and W. A. Visser 't Hooft, contains much valuable information, and all interested in ecumenical movements would do well to read it. The summaries of the various doctrinal conceptions of the Church are useful, and the chapters on the functions of the Church and its witness and action in corporate life full of suggestion. Especially is it well to be reminded that the witness of Christians doing their daily work has far more effect on society than the resolutions passed by ecclesiastical assemblies, and that the work of adult religious education has as yet scarcely begun. (We hope Congregationalists will turn their attention to the idea of week-end gatherings for lay folk.)

Dr. H. P. Douglass's *A Decade of Objective Progress in Church Unity* (Harper, $1.50) was prepared for the Edinburgh Conference by the Commission on the Church's Unity in Life and Worship. It summarizes unions between churches, negotiations for union, and results of unions already achieved, and altogether is a useful work of reference.

Though it deals too much in superlatives and indeed is not well written, Mr. William Teeling's *The Pope In Politics* (Dickson, 7s. 6d.) is a significant and timely book. Written by a young Irish Catholic, it describes the life, work, and character of the present Pope, and his attitude to public affairs in all parts of the world. Mr. Teeling is critical and outspoken, especially about the government of the Church, which is in the hands of men who in any other sphere would have reached the age of retirement, and about the impossibility of securing influence for men of post-war mentality. The Pope's dread of Communism has thrown him into the hands of the Fascists, with what appears to Mr. Teeling unfortunate consequences in America, the Mission Field, and among youth generally, to whom the Pope's

> independence is compromised by being completely surrounded by Italian mentality and Italian influence, which make a really independent sovereignty almost impossible.

On all aspects of the subject the book is of interest : we mention especially the methods adopted by R.C. missions (p. 240) and by French Catholics in Canada. Protestants would do well to study Mr. Teeling's chapters.

Many readers will find it useful to have for the pocket a day by day book of prayers, *Along the Way* (Independent Press, 1s. 6d.), compiled by Drs. John Stevens and W. Arthur Tatchell.

Canon W. Thompson Elliott has written in *Back to God* (Nisbet, 2s. 6d.) a helpful little book which follows up the Archbishop of Canterbury's "Recall". Drawing on a reserve of long pastoral experience the Vicar of Leeds is uniformly practical and never out of touch with the realities of life.

Comfort in Ordeals (Burns, Oates, 5s.) is the last volume of Mr. Algar Thorold's translation of the Spiritual Letters of Fr. J. P. de Caussade. The letters show how thoroughly the Jesuits analyse the spiritual life and the human soul.

It has often been a matter of conjecture why Scotsmen are so strongly nationalist; during the Great War such was the feeling in most of Scotland that the conscientious objector was given short shrift. With this in mind the appointment of a Committee by the Church of Scotland to discuss *The Church's Attitude to Peace and War* (S.C.M., 1s.) was of more than ordinary interest, and its Report is a valuable document. After statements of the Pacifist and Non-Pacifist Positions and "The Tasks to be Attempted Together", the Report contains the following Appendixes: "The Mind of Jesus Christ on War" (Prin. W. A. Curtis, Prof. G. H. C. Macgregor); "Conscientious Objectors in Various Countries" (Dr. J. Hutchison Cockburn); "The Law of Love" (Rev. John Muir); "The Witness of the Early Church" (Rev. J. Pitt Watson); "Some Notes towards a Christian Philosophy of the State" (Rev. Edward T. Vernon); "The Idea of a Super-State" (Mr. F. P. Shepherd); "The Commonwealth Ideal" (Colonel Norman MacLeod); "Reform of the League of Nations" (Dr. G. F. Barbour); and "Oecumenical Christian Organizations" (Dr. James Patrick).

Dr. Macpherson Lawrie, the author of *Nature Hits Back,* has now written *Love, Marriage and Divorce* (Methuen, 5s.) in the same strain. Antony and his wife have been divorced, and Dr. Lawrie examines their lives from babyhood to show the reasons for the failure of their marriage. Occasionally, as in the undue stress laid on weaning, he reflects too much the pre-occupation of psychologists to-day, but generally he is sane and practical, and refreshingly free from the fashions of the moment. He writes clearly, and evidently from conviction, and backs up his contentions from his clinical experience.

Mrs. D. R. Blitzsten's *Psycho-Analysis Explained* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) is a brief and non-technical account which will serve as an introduction for those who desire to know what psycho-analysis is.

"From the fourth century B.C. Cynicism endured to the last days of the ancient world", and in his *History of Cynicism* (Methuen, 12s. 6d.) Dr. Donald R. Dudley has provided a sufficient and scholarly account of a movement in which Diogenes has too long been allowed to obscure other figures. There will always be need for the message that life can be lived on any terms the age can impose, though Christians will prefer to hear it in the words "Endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ". Dr. Dudley sees Cynicism as

> a vagrant ascetic life, an assault on all established values, and a body of literary genres particularly well adapted to satire and popular philosophical propaganda.

Dr. Dudley has missed little in his well-documented description of the life and teaching of individual Cynics down to the 6th century.

Prof. H. E. Butler has rendered good service in translating and editing *The Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis* (Cape, 15s.). Prof. C. H. Williams writes an Introduction, and many readers who have found Giraldus's Latin too difficult for them will be glad to have his story, which Prof. Butler has collected from various parts of his writings. Giraldus made a strong fight for independence in church life, and Congregationalists especially should read his pages with satisfaction.

Dr. W. T. Whitley's *The English Bible under the Tudor Sovereigns* (Marshall, 2s. 6d.) is issued in connexion with the Commemoration of the Fourth Centenary of the Reformation. Dr. Whitley makes good use of an abundance of material—Wyclif, Erasmus, Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Taverner, the Bishops', the Genevan, and the Douai Bibles. The illustrations help in making a timely handbook. At the same time comes Mr. Charles Eason's *The Genevan Bible* (Downie, 1s.), notes on the production and distribution of the version which made the English the "people of one book" : Mr. Eason shows that it ran to over 180 editions. Students will long be grateful for this compilation.

Dr. A. G. Mackinnon, whose writings on the Eternal City are so well known, has given us in *Beyond the Alps* (Oliphants, 3s. 6d.) an inspiring account of the work of the Presbyterian Church in Italy and Malta. At times when it needed great courage the ministers of that Church have held services, and in Rome, Florence, Leghorn, and Genoa have borne their witness : it is good to have this record of their work.

The late Dr. J. A. Duke did not live to complete the history of the Church in Scotland which he had planned, but the first volume, *History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation* (Oliver & Boyd, 12s. 6d.) was finished and now sees the light. With *The Columban Church* Dr. Duke had secured recognition as a careful and enthusiastic historian, and his sketch of the Columban period, of the "Pictish and Scoto-Pictish Church" (717-1070) and of the Roman Church bears the same characteristics. The final chapter, "The Foundations of the Reformed Church", formed an excellent introduction to the next volume, which it is to be regretted Dr. Duke was not able to write.

Prof. G. D. Henderson has done well to gather together the papers printed in *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland* (Cambridge Press, 15s.), adding full notes, as well as three articles not previously printed—"The Influence of Bishop Patrick Forbes", "The Covenanters", and "The Scottish Pulpit in the 17th Century". The other papers are "The Bible in 17th Century Scotland", "Foreign Religious Influences in 17th Century Scotland", "Scotland and the Synod of Dort", "Some Early Scottish Independents", "Scottish Theological Learning in the 17th Century", "Externals of Church Worship and Church Government in Scotland under Charles II", "Quietist Influences in Scotland and Religious Conditions in the North East of Scotland after the Revolution". We hoped for a little more light on the visits of Browne and Penry to Scotland, about which so little is known. Prof. Henderson is doing excellent work in this field, and we look for further contributions from his pen.

A new Chetham Society volume is Mr. Ernest Axon's reprint of Oliver Heywood's *Life of John Angier of Denton* (Manchester University, 12s. 6d.). Mr. Axon also prints Angier's diary, "Cases of Conscience re-

solved" by him, his dying speeches, extracts from his *Helpe to Better Hearts, for Better Times,* and also the diary of Samuel, Angier's nephew. Angier lived a long and interesting life (1605-1677); Heywood, who married his daughter, knew him well, and students of 17th century Nonconformity will be grateful to Mr. Axon for this competent reprint. So they will be for Dr. S. W. Carruthers's important and scholarly volume, *The Westminster Confession of Faith* (Aikman, 12s. 6d.), which not only prints a critical text, but gives an account of the preparation and printing of the seven leading editions. Dr. Carruthers builds on the work of his father before him, and his work is definitive.

"Examinees" will find Mr. William Edwards's *Crown, People, and Parliament, 1760-1935* (Arrowsmith, 8s. 6d.) very serviceable. Under "The Crown" he deals with "The Personality of the Sovereign", "The "Prerogative of the Crown", and "The Influence of the Sovereign"; under "The People" with Reform, the Franchise, and Local Government; and under "Parliament" with the two Houses in turn, Party Government, the Prime Minister, and the Cabinet. Mr. Edwards does not seem to be aware that Lord Derby in 1878 had the Queen's sanction to explain his resignation and quote documents.

The sub-title of Messrs. Raymond Postgate and Aylmer Vallance's *Those Foreigners* (Harrap, 10s. 6d.) is "The English People's Opinion on Foreign Affairs as reflected in their Newspapers since Waterloo". The compilers do not conceal their own political prepossessions, but they have drawn on papers of all Parties—in the last thirty years the *Times, Manchester Guardian, News Chronicle, Daily Herald, Morning Post, Daily Express, Daily Mail* are frequently used as well as the *Spectator* and *John Bull*. It is good to see not only public opinion in times of crisis, but the way public opinion was manipulated.

Despite the title of Prof. R. W. Seton-Watson's *Britain in Europe, 1789-1914* (Cambridge Press, 30s.) the period dealt with is really 1822-1874. For the preceding years there is a Prologue, and for the last an Epilogue, while in *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question,* published while the present book was in writing, Dr. Seton-Watson has dealt with the subject he has made his own. The value of this survey of foreign policy—a large volume of 700 pages, fully annotated—is that it gathers between two covers what previously has been widely scattered, and it takes account of documents and biographies which have never been brought so intimately together. The narrative is readable and never dull, and Prof. Seton-Watson is a safe guide; he can be trusted not to minimize those Near Eastern relationships which students have found dry and statesmen a constant annoyance, but which have profoundly affected the history of mankind. In view of recent discussions it is interesting to have Prof. Seton-Watson's opinion about Cyprus:

> To this day, there is no justification for its retention, unless to keep out the Italians: and Sir Samuel Baker's dictum still holds good—If we are supreme at sea, Cyprus is not wanted, and if not, it is an encumbrance.

"Peaceful Change" is one of the chief problems confronting the nation today and the words appear in the title of two books recently published. It is wise to read first Mr. C. R. M. F. Cruttwell's *History of Peaceful Change* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), written for the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Mr. Cruttwell has already shown his gifts in one of the best histories of the War so far written, and by this survey of changes

which have taken place without the use of war since 1815 he has placed students still further in his debt. He classifies his material under: "Disputes about Boundaries and Sovereignties"; "Cession"; "Creation and Extinction of Sovereignty"; "Popular Consultations and Plebiscites" and "Changes of Status". His opinion is that while the 19th century "showed a much greater elasticity in deciding between essentials and non-essentials" than the 20th has so far done, the latter has two great advantages—"a collective organization which contains the promise of being converted into an instrument of international conciliation and revision, more permanent, more impartial and more universal than the old Concert of Europe; an improvement in the technique and international character of the plebiscite". *Peaceful Change* (Macmillan, 5s.) is a symposium by Professors of the London School of Economics edited by Prof. C. A. W. Manning and introduced by Dr. C. K. Webster in the best lecture of the series. It is significant that the legal and psychological chapters are the longest.

In his Preface to *Prelude to 1937* (Murray, 5s.) Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw says that he is conscious in dealing with the years 1931 to 1936 that however he may strive to be impartial, he cannot escape from his political prepossessions. Prof. Hearnshaw does not strive very hard; he tells us near the beginning that the ex-Kaiser is his *bête noire,* words like "scandalous" are frequent, and everything of the Left is mercilessly criticized. Nevertheless, if the prepossessions be not forgotten by the reader, the sketch is timely and useful. Sir Malcolm Stewart's name is misspelt.

In *Some Great Political Idealists of the Christian Era* (Harrap, 10s. 6d.) Dr. Hearnshaw has gathered together the lectures he delivered in the nine well-known King's College series. They deal with Augustine, Wyclif, Machiavelli, Grotius, Bolingbroke, Rousseau, Burke, Austin, and Spencer. They have been revised and the bibliographies brought up to date, and will be found specially useful by undergraduates taking political theory.

The late Mrs. Fortescue's *Queens and Princesses of Olden Days* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) leaves us marvelling that monarchy has survived even to the extent it has done. Rushing round the Europe of the 18th and 19th centuries, Mrs. Fortescue lifts a series of curtains revealing amazing scenes of ineptitude, madness, adultery, and lust. We learn of Queens and Princesses who bore six children by the time they were 25 and ten before they were 32; of families of 15, 16, and 17; and of morganatic marriages and mistresses galore. Some of Mrs. Fortescue's canvasses are too crowded, but there are some charming vignettes, like that of Matilda of Denmark, and the whole book is very readable. Slips on pp. 254 and 280 need attention.

The brief biographies in the "World-makers and World-shakers" series (Hogarth Press, 1s. 6d. each) are evidently intended for young people: though this is not categorically stated, it is evident from the way—some cannot escape it—in which most of the writers "talk down" to their readers. Nevertheless the volumes will be found useful: it has taken (how difficult it must have been!) two writers (Mrs. Mitchison and Mr. R. H. S. Crossman) to write the 80-page *Socrates*; Miss Sackville-West does *Joan of Arc,* Miss Marjorie Strachie *Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour,* and Mr. L. B. Pekin *Darwin,* perhaps the most successful of the four.

In *After Many Days* (Hale, 12s. 6d.) Sir Frank Fletcher has given us an entertaining book of reminiscences, in which he has certainly succeeded in his endeavour to "make the life of a public school intelligible to those

who do not know it from within". Sir Frank, of course, has unusual qualifications : a boy at Rossall, assistant master at Rugby, master in turn at Marlborough and Charterhouse, and long and honourable service in the Headmasters' Conference. There are many pen-pictures of schoolmasters —some of them well-known, like T. E. Page, others whose fame never went beyond a limited school circle. Few people will not learn something from these lively pages, which make one realize anew the responsibility of a schoolmaster's life and the fine spirit which many men bring to it.

Mr. C. B. Purdom's *The Perfect Master* (Williams & Norgate, 12s. 6d.) is a life of Shri Meher Baba, "the Perfect Master", who, born at Poona in 1894, has been under a vow of silence since 1925. Baba, who is hailed as one of the "God realized", a perfect saint who has mastered life and is now one with God, is not an attractive person as Mr. Purdom portrays him. He seems to live surrounded by adoring disciples and to be entirely self-centred, changing his plans from moment to moment regardless of the convenience of others : there does not seem to be much point in the silence when an alphabet board is in constant use. Mr. Purdom has done good work in letting us see one of these "Masters" so closely. Baba seems to be a pale shadow of Mahatma Gandhi, without the latter's attractiveness.

One of the most rewarding books we have read this quarter is Miss Vida D. Scudder's *On Journey* (Dent, 10s. 6d.—cheap as books go), the autobiography of one of the leaders of the women's education movement in the United States. A virile mind, yet feminine in its expression, Miss Scudder's observations on the struggles for peace, economic freedom, and the rights of personality are thoughtful and thought provoking. Her account of life at Smith and Wellesley, of travels in England and Europe, of co-operation with Socialists and experiments in religion, of Sabatier, the biographer of St. Francis, and J. M. Dent the publisher—it is all intensely interesting. Miss Scudder has seen life steadily, if not entirely whole, and she has managed to combine Catholicism (what in this country would be called Anglo-Catholicism) with Socialism and Pacifism. She has given us a long book, but we do not think any reader will regret the time spent on it. It is good to have the matured wisdom of one who has played so great a part in important movements during a long life.

The Rev. W. Wilson Cash gives his **Christendom and Islam* (S.C.M., 5s.) the sub-title "Their Contacts and Cultures down the Centuries". It is a book packed with facts and apt quotations, but these are not more striking than the sympathy of the author with a faith he does not share. Perhaps the best chapters are those on "The Expansion of Islam and the Shrinkage of Christendom" and "The Contribution of Christianity to Islamic Thought and Life", in the latter of which he shows how Sufi-ism "had its inception in an essentially Christian environment". We hope that both Moslems and Christians will read this understanding survey, to which a handy table of dates is added.

In **India Reveals Herself* (Oxford Press, 5s.) Mr. Basil Mathews has described so vividly what he has seen and heard—and he has talked with people of all sorts and kinds—in a five months' tour that the reader will find it hard to forget his pictures. Whether he is describing the villages, the problems of agriculture, the religious rivalry, the perfervid nationalism, the growing economic demands, or the place of women, he has always the apt phrase and the telling illustration. Ministers would do well to get their young people to start thinking about India—Mr. Mathews believes, and with reason, that events in India in the next decade may determine the course

of the world's history—by discussing this book. Once or twice names—and not only names—seem to be misspelt, and we doubt whether Mr. H. A. L. Fisher would call himself a "rationalist" or whether he taught economics.

The chapters in *Germany's New Religion* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) are by the three Tübingen Professors, Wilhelm Hauer, the leader of the German Faith Movement, Karl Heim, the Protestant theologian, and Karl Adam, the Roman Catholic. After describing the origin of the Movement, Hauer asks (in a lecture) "An Alien or a German Faith?", and then discusses "The Semitic Character of Christianity". Heim points out weaknesses in Hauer's teaching, insisting on man's moral responsibility and on God's transcendence. Adam, without mentioning Hauer, puts the R.C. view. The two points which struck us most forcibly in Hauer's exposition were his emphasis on Government control of education (school and university) and such phrases as "Without guilt a man does not come into being. Therefore guilt is man's destiny", which brought back to mind the "new theology" in the first decade of this century.

After reading the last book the reader should turn immediately to Sir Charles Grant Robertson's cogent Beckly Lecture, *Religion and the Totalitarian State* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.), with its full appendixes and its two conclusions :

> The spiritual freedom which the Christian demands, and without which the Christian religion and the Christian Church cannot exist, can neither be secured nor exercised without securing and exercising other freedoms—intellectual, moral, political, social and economic : and in demanding and fighting for that spiritual freedom, the Christian is fighting also for freedoms to be enjoyed by those who may remain indifferent or are antagonistic to the Christian religion.

Mr. J. Middleton Murry is always worth reading, and those who studied *The Necessity of Communism* will open *The Necessity of Pacifism* (Cape, 3s. 6d.) with some eagerness. We say "studied" rather than "read" because it is impossible to profit by Mr. Murry's thinking aloud unless one is prepared to think hard one's self. He has now come to this conclusion :

> There is no way forward for us but that which leads to the revolution of Jesus—towards a Socialism of voluntary community and absolute but non-violent resistance to war.
>
> In defending democracy by war we shall lose it for ever ; in defending Christianity by war we shall annihilate it ; in seeking Socialism by war we shall achieve barbarism instead. We can defend democracy today only by surpassing it, we can defend Christianity only by being Christian, we can advance towards Socialism only by refusing war : for what Socialism is not yet strong enough, or convinced enough to do, Pacifism has strength and means to do—namely, to reassert the ultimate reality of the individual man.

In arguing this on the whole convincing thesis Mr. Murry makes excellent use of Cromwell, on the one hand, and of his experience in the Adelphi Centre, on the other. He still believes D. H. Lawrence to have been a genius—and the last genius; but this obsession should not prevent a significant book from having careful attention.

What is the Marxist philosophy? The Leningrad Institute of Philosophy has prepared a textbook in Dialectical Materialism for the training of young Communists. This volume has been translated, and, with some modifications by the editor, Dr. John Lewis, appears in English

as *A Textbook of Marxist Philosophy* (Gollancz, 5s.). The last three sections of the book—"Unity and the Strife of Opposites"; "The Law of Transition of Quantity into Quality"; and "The Negation of the Negation"—contain the exposition as written by the Russian authors, but Dr. Lewis, in addition to a general introduction, writes an historical account of the Marxist philosophy in place of the longer Russian chapters. It would be interesting to know what young Russians — "not only students of philosophy but engineers, doctors, chemists, teachers, in fact all who pass through the higher technical schools and institutes" — make of this book.

Sometimes the taste of the *hors-d'œuvres* spoils a meal, and perhaps it was the cock-a-whoop first two pages which caused us to like Dr. Henry Bett's *The Spirit of Methodism* (Epworth Press, 6s.) less than any of his previous books. The same taste is, however, discernible on other pages. Writing in the Conference number of the *Methodist Times* a few weeks ago, we suggested that a discussion whether Isaac Watts or Charles Wesley had rendered the greater service to the Church's worship would be a good subject for debate. Dr. Bett had, however, already decided the matter:

> But there can surely be no kind of parallel between Dr. Watts and Charles Wesley, except for one hymn, "When I survey the wondrous cross". Otherwise no comparison is possible between the hymns by the two writers, as to religious or literary quality; neither is there any parity whatever as to the extent of their influence upon the religious life of English Christendom.

We should not have thought that even Methodist enthusiasm could go these lengths, and that quotation in itself will show that Dr. Bett is far below his usual level. This is not the place to pit Watts against Wesley, and we content ourselves by noting that the Chambers' *Encyclopædia of English Literature* says that "Jesus shall reign where'er the sun" is the "first great missionary hymn" and that "Our God, our help" "has been pronounced 'the most majestic hymn in English speech'". Dr. Bett should have been too confident of Charles Wesley's greatness to belittle a hymn-writer equally great. The last chapter of the book, in which the author looks to the future, contains some wise words about reunion and appeals to Methodists to recapture the early rapture and stress once again the reality of evangelical experience.

Mr. John S. Hoyland introduces *Experiments in Social Reconstruction* (Allenson, 2s. 6d.) in an essay on "The Basis of Social Experimentation". The experiments are the Nursery School, the Bryanston School Pioneers, the Rhondda Clubs, Tyneside Reconstruction, the Salford Women's Centre, the Rhymney Outcrop Scheme, Homecrofting, Land Settlement, and Subsistence Production.

It is a pity somebody cannot train the writers of the Left to write objectively: Mr. G. D. H. Cole might have done it, but even he finds it difficult to let the facts speak for themselves. Mr. Allen Hutt's *The Post-War History of the British Working Class, 1918-1937* (Gollancz, 6s.) is written definitely from the school which is more concerned to attack the leaders of the Labour Party than the "capitalist enemy"; no words are too strong for the condemnation of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald; everything that is done by Unemployed Marchers and the like is approved. Mr. Hutt writes forcibly always and sometimes well; his pages on the General Strike are the best in the book.

Eleventh Hour Questions (Moray Press, 3s. 6d.), a publication of the newly formed Scottish Peace Council, is a very mixed bag, with divines like Drs. C. H. C. Macgregor and Hector Macpherson, M.P.'s like Sir

Archibald Sinclair, Messrs. Robert Boothby, William Gallacher, and J. Henderson Stewart, and representatives of finance, science, literature, and youth. The contributions vary greatly in length and effectiveness.

Ministers will be glad to have the Rev. Wilton Rix's *Little Church* (Independent Press, 9d.), an account of the Children's Church at Ealing.

In Book II of *Religious Instruction* (Nelson, 2s. 6d.) Mr. A. E. Ikin, the late Director of Education at Blackpool, deals with the religious education of pupils from 7 to 11. The volume is absolutely "on the spot", and full of practical help. Appendixes deal with the history of "Reorganized Schools" and "Agreed Syllabuses" and the Syllabus of Lessons to commemorate the Fourth Centenary of the English Bible.

The story of Kagawa is told for young people by the Rev. T. Wemyss Reid in *Kagawa, Mystic and Man of Action* (Independent Press, 9d.) and for children by the Rev. J. M. M. Ferguson in *Kagawa the Fearless* (Independent Press, 6d.).

The Rev. W. F. Rowlands's *The Plain and the People* (Livingstone Press, 1s.) should be circulated far and wide by the L.M.S., to which Society Mr. Rowlands belongs. It tells of missionary work on the North China plain, conducted on the policy of Mr. S. J. W. Clark. It answers in the affirmative the question:

> Is it possible under the conditions of village life in China to found churches on the New Testament model?

and bases the answer on the experience of the last twenty years. The evangelistic staff must be mobile, the churches formed not only self-supporting from the beginning, but marked by Life, Prayer, Fellowship, Bible-reading (here the phonetic script and the magnificent achievement of the Peill brothers comes in), and Service. Churches of this kind, founded in—and on—faith propagate themselves.

In *The Great Island* (Livingstone Press, 1s.) the Rev. H. A. Ridgwell recounts the eventful story of missionary enterprise in Madagascar, in which the L.M.S. has played no small part, while *In the Hidden Province* (Carey Press, 1s.), by Miss Kathleen M. Shuttleworth, tells the story of the work of the Baptist Missionary Society in Shensi.

Miss Kathleen M. Shepherd's *The Land and Life of Japan* (Livingstone Press, 2s.) in the new "Land and Life" series, has some excellent illustrations, and it is readable and informing.

All students of the Elizabethan age will find Prof. E. C. Dunn's *The Literature of Shakespeare's England* (Scribners, 7s. 6d.) an extremely refreshing volume. Poetry and prose, Spenser and Ralegh (we follow Miss Dunn's spelling), the background of the drama of Shakespeare and of others whose work has been overshadowed by his greatness—on all this Miss Dunn has something to say which, if not new, is said in a new way. Of particular interest is the chapter on "The Progress of Prose", with its recognition of the part played by the sermon and the pamphlet in the development, Miss Dunn would say "the making", of English prose. It is remarkable that in this valuable chapter Miss Dunn mentions neither the Genevan version of the Bible nor the most striking of the pamphlets of the period, those by Martin Marprelate. We are grateful to Miss Dunn for her pages, though sometimes we wish she were a little more precise, especially when in introducing us to a recent book by Louis Wright she gives two versions of the title.

The jacket calls Mr. Henry Williamson's *Richard Jefferies* (Faber, 7s. 6d.) "a short condensed biography and critical appraisal by a fellow

author, who since boyhood has been devoted to the personality of Jefferies as revealed by his writings". It contains "Selections from his Work, with details of his Life and Circumstance, his Death and Immortality". Even if one cannot altogether share Mr. Williamson's enthusiasm one can share his indignation with the scholar who described Jefferies as a "mere cataloguer". The selections Mr. Williamson has strung together do include sufficient of his hero's potboilers to explain the critic's opinion: the two sections of "Amaryllis at the Fair" show Jefferies at his best and worst—it would be hard to find anything of its kind better than the description of old Iden's meal or of the mice running up his legs to eat the crumbs as he woke from his after-dinner nap; but when he begins to let imagination play with Amadis—!

It is better to be amused than irritated, and Sir George MacMunn's partisanship and idolatry of Kipling—no small boy ever adored a cricket professional more—are of so wholehearted a kind that he arouses many a smile. The critic of Kipling (Arnold Bennett, for example), the pacifist, and the non-Imperialist are mercilessly belaboured, for

> of all things Kipling loathed traitors and all those who in the guise of ultra-Liberalism would sell their country's soul.

This particular outburst is caused by the "extraordinary attempt" of an "egregious Government"

> to coerce Ulster when the whole consensus of all opinion that mattered was, "Ulster will fight, and Ulster will be right".

For 37 years a soldier, 25 of them in India and Burma, Sir George can enter into Kipling's Indian stories as few can, and his admiration is easy to understand. *Rudyard Kipling: Craftsman* (Hale, 10s. 6d.) surveys all Kipling's writings. One of the most revealing things we learn from him is that Kipling owed much to the Old Testament, Shakespeare, and the legend and ritual of Freemasons. Kipling's reputation was slowly recovering from the reaction resulting from the absurd adulation of the Imperialists; it is hoped that Sir George will not retard that recovery or cause a relapse. We should like to have his comment on R.L.S.'s words about Kipling: "All the good fairies came to his christening: and they were all drunk".

Mr. C. E. M. Joad is never an easy author to review, and *The Testament of Joad* (Faber, 8s. 6d.), with its jerkiness, its weird admixture of wisdom and folly, seriousness and levity, is no exception. It tells us how Mr. Joad looks on life, and on Joad, especially Joad, of whom he has no mean opinion. Sometimes he is merely mischievous, at others perverse in order to draw attention to himself, or seemingly doing it just to annoy. Then at others he stimulates thought, exciting agreement or disagreement, often violently. The country, art, women, war, religion, beauty, civilization—on all these Mr. Joad discourses in lively style, with stinging comments and malicious irony, evidently enjoying himself the while. Readers will find him often irritating, but he performs a useful function.

The main impression Mr. R. Welldon Finn's *The English Heritage* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) leaves on the mind is marvel that any writer should think this book would in any way appeal to "the tourist or holiday-maker." It contains a good deal of solid information not to be found in guide-books, but it can hardly be imagined that any but serious students will read it. Some of the chapters, especially that on the Middle Ages, are good, but that on the Puritan Legacy is a strange mixture of eccentricity and acceptance of current views. Victoria, for example, is called "in every respect the apotheosis of militant Puritanism", which attained its height,

"enlisting under its banner all the forces of hypocrisy", in the enforced abdication of Edward VIII!

Prof. G. M. Trevelyan introduces Mr. J. Dixon-Scott's *England Under Trust* (MacLehose, 7s. 6d.), a descriptive account of the principal properties held by the National Trust. Some 60,000 acres are now in charge of the Trust, and Mr. Dixon-Scott's excellent photographs show how fortunate the country is in securing possession of such areas and buildings. It is hoped that many more gifts of like kind will be made to the Trust.

The charm of Mr. John Drinkwater's *Robinson of England* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.) increases our regret that it is his last book. Had he been able to put the final touches on the book we do not think he would have spoken of goalposts as beautifully proportioned, or of a "beautiful little folio", but he could scarcely have improved on the tone of the book. Robinson, having taken a double first at Oxford, finds himself in love with England, and satisfied only when he can feel her throbbing life and write about her. He settles in the Cotswolds and has two nieces and a nephew to stay with him for a fortnight. He introduces them to the land he loves—its countryside, its customs and its crafts, its past and its present, its literature and its people—and he finds his way to the heart of the reader as he did to the hearts of the three delightful children.

In *Love and Thought in Animals and Men* (Methuen, 6s.) Dr. Serge Voronoff, the restorer of youth, argues that animals are endowed with intelligence and feelings. The section of the book dealing with man is nothing like so pertinent as that dealing with animals, in which Dr. Voronoff presents much striking evidence for intelligence in ants, dogs, horses, elephants, and—his special favourites—monkeys.

Mr. George Dilnot's *Man Hunters: Great Detectives and Their Achievements* (Hale, 12s. 6d.) presents a dramatic account of the work of sleuths in England, America, and the Continent. The official detective has often been an object *pour rire* in thrillers. In describing some of the world's most famous crimes, Mr. Dilnot shows the thoroughness and skill with which the 'tec goes about his job. The book is a reporter's book, and it holds the reader.

An admirer of Sir Hugh Walpole has lately heard with regret young people say that they have not been able to finish some of his recent books—*The Inquisitor* was a case in point: with anxiety, too, for it would be regrettable if the younger generation were to miss the stimulus of the writer of *Fortitude*. We fear that *John Cornelius* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) will not reinstate Sir Hugh in the good graces of his critics. It is the study of a romantic who believed himself destined for greatness and believed, too, in all mankind. John is a likeable figure, and is pathetic when his novels and his play are either ridiculed or treated with indifference or when he meets with cruelty or ingratitude. Anne does not seem to us to cohere; despite her parentage and the inexhaustible combinations of which her sex is capable we cannot see her in some of the situations in which her creator places her. There are many excellent character studies, many of them of the extraordinary people Sir Hugh loves to portray, but the book has the appearance of a patchwork quilt as if many things have been worked in at different times. And there are sentences on pages 317 and 374 which Mr. Walpole would not have let pass: the second might have been one of Mr. A. S. M. Hutchinson's!

Mr. Deeds, of the same romantic type as John Cornelius, is already known to all the world through one of last year's most popular films. It is probable, however, that Mr. C. B. Kelland's *Mr. Deeds Goes To Town*

(Barker, 7s. 6d.) will disappoint the film fans, who will miss a good deal and not find sufficient compensation in the addition of a murder mystery.

Mr. Richard Sale's *Is a Ship Burning?* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.) is a vivid narrative which describes the burning of a pleasure ship at sea. Even allowing for the fact that Mr. Sale had an actual incident of the kind to help him, his account grips the reader, though it perhaps flags a little once the raft and the boat are reached.

Mr. H. E. Bates's *Something Short and Sweet* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) contains sixteen short stories. Most of them are powerfully written, telling of passion expressed or frustrated; some set man in the environment of nature, which Mr. Bates can describe so well. "The Sow and Silas" is very amusing, the story of the dwarf as moving as anything we have read for a long time, and "The Man Who Loved Cats" horrible; several others leave the reader tantalizingly in the air.

Herr Lion Feuchtwanger has been fortunate in the translators of his novel *The False Nero* (Hutchinson, 8s. 6d.), in which he recounts the adventures of the potter, Terence, who, like Nero in appearance, was accepted as Emperor by millions in the East. Terence, Varro, Knops, Jumping Jack, the Roman Generals, and the Eastern potentates are all very much alive. They all appear, so to say, ready to step forth from the canvas, which, not being so crowded as that of *Jew Süss,* makes a better picture.

Mr. T. Thompson goes from strength to strength: his intimate knowledge of the life of the Lancashire workers and his mastery of the dialect make his sketches a constant joy. *Lancashire Lustre* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) contains 32 sketches, and some of them are absolutely perfect.

A warm welcome will surely be given to Miss Constance Holme's collection of short stories and sketches, *The Wisdom of the Simple* (Oxford Press, 2s.). The stories are characteristic, with "Tommy Thompson's Christmas Shopping" providing a very amusing interlude; the sketches towards the end are not up to the general level.

Miss F. Tennyson Jesse's *Act of God* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) is an unusual novel. Its scene is Provence, its hero an Englishman living in his ketch off the coast, a sensible detached observer of the life of the village where the "act of God" is performed, his only friend, despite his scepticism, the rather lovable *curé*. What the "act of God" was, and how the influx of "Groupers" provided the spark which caused the fire, must not be told. The "Groupers" do not appear to advantage, and the Roman Church is redeemed only by the character of the *curé*. The end of the story is hurried and unsatisfactory, and unworthy of the preceding chapters. Miss Tennyson Jesse makes her people live, and she knows the ways of ships and sailors: some of her readers, we imagine, will skip the theological discussions.

Miss Mary Mitchell's *Decline and Fall of a British Matron* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) is a skilful piece of work. We thought that Miss Mitchell was going to make a flop and reform Venetia in the middle when she ran away to the Continent. It would, however, have been quite mistaken to give the spineless and self-indulgent girl any character at all, as Miss Mitchell sees. Both Venetia and her mother are brilliantly drawn, and the story deserves its sub-title, "A Caustic Comedy".

We do not know whether Miss E. M. Delafield has been inspired to write a tract-novel by Mr. A. P. Herbert's *Holy Deadlock*, but that is what *Nothing is Safe* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is. It tells of the lives of two

children, a "sensitive" Terry aged 12 and a matter-of-fact Julia two years younger. Their parents have been divorced and have re-married, and the children are left in the air. Whether "moderns" regard their responsibilities as lightly as this father and mother, or are quite so contemptible as their friends, we are not prepared to say. With her wonted skill in depicting character Miss Delafield certainly proves that "the children pay".

We scarcely think that the compilation of *Ladies and Gentlemen in Victorian Fiction* (Hogarth Press, 10s. 6d.) was a task worthy of a writer of Miss Delafield's calibre. From the minor novelists of the Victorian age (Charlotte M. Yonge most of all) she has collected and arranged passages under the headings "Papa and Mama", "'Only the Governess'", "Declaration of Feeling", "Enjoying Ill-Health", "All Is Vanity", "'Is This a Party of Pleasure?'", and "The Fair Sex". The result is entertaining, but it has a pot-boiler flavour.

The jacket speaks of Mr. Noel Coward's nine plays in *To-night at 8.30* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) as a "brilliant cycle of plays". Perhaps the fact that they are now gathered into a volume indicates that Mr. Coward is also of this opinion; we wish it could be ascertained whether the distinguished actors and actresses to whom the plays are dedicated share it. Some of the plays are humorous, but there is scarcely a character with any integrity, backbone, or moral sense in the nine; if all the people Mr. Coward meets are "froth and bubble" like the people in these plays nobody need envy him his good fortune.

EDITOR.

Mr. Edward Langton's *The Ministries of Angelic Powers* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.) is a diligent collection of the references to angels and their functions in the Old Testament, the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books, and in Rabbinic literature. The commentaries and other helps to the understanding of the passages are cited, and the writer indicates his own preference. There is no systematic attempt to trace the development of the belief and this lack robs the subject of some of its interest. The book suffers, in fact, by having no definite thesis, other than the repeated and rather plaintive plea that there may be something in angels after all our talk of mythology, *etc.* The book will have some use as an indication of the material, but it makes no original contribution to the study of the subject.

The same author has written a sequel to the foregoing, under the title of *The Angel Teaching of the New Testament* (Clarke, 5s.), which treats in succession the angelology of the Gospels, the *Acts*, the Pauline Epistles, *Hebrews* and other Epistles, *Revelation*. The same view of the veridity of angel-appearances is maintained; *e.g.*, "the quieting of the outer senses and the physical life during sleep or trance affords a favourable opportunity for beings of the spiritual world to make communications to men". He follows the same method of citing the views of a number of commentators, *etc.*, and then indicating his own choice. We would again suggest that the proper method is to state and discuss the data of the literature, with greater independence of other writers. But the book (which seems to us a better one than its forerunner) is the result of wide reading and honest labour, and brings together in a compendious form a large amount of varying exegetical material, which should make it useful for reference. Like its predecessor, the book is well-indexed.

Dr. T. Walker's *Hebrew Religion between the Testaments* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.) is a classified review of the teaching of the Apocrypha and Pseud-

epigrapha about God, his sovereignty and providence, man, duty, and the life beyond. Under each of these six topics a large number of brief illustrative quotations is given. The title "Hebrew" should be "Jewish". There is not sufficient recognition of the variety of the teaching, *e.g.*, quotations from the Alexandrian Book of Wisdom are taken together with very different Palestinian beliefs, and no account is taken of the more or less non-Apocalyptic Rabbinism. Probably no single Jew ever held all the beliefs here gathered, so that it is rather misleading to call the book "An Exposition of the Judaism of the Home of Jesus". However, it will serve a useful purpose in calling the attention of the general reader to many striking passages in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature, and in showing how much moral and religious teaching this literature contains which is common with that of the New Testament. The well-chosen selections from the Jewish Prayer Book should send some Gentile readers to search amongst its treasures for themselves.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Rev. F. Warburton Lewis has now followed up his two books on Jesus with a wholly admirable study of Paul, under the title *Saul of Tarsus* (Nicholson & Watson, 6s.), a book which is sure of a very wide welcome. The interpretation of the Apostle, based on his early life and the experience on the Damascus road, is dramatic. It is also an intimate account of the growth of Paul's mind and spirit, and of his preparation for the work of the Gospel, by one whose own spiritual insight gives him a key to unlock many of the perplexing questions in Paul's career. Mr. Warburton Lewis brings out what Dr. Robert Mackintosh in his essay on "Paul & Paulinism" calls the revolutionary element in Paul's life—"Astounding! heart-breaking! soul-shattering! terrible, yet infinitely glorious! Old things pass away, and the whole universe becomes new! *After all, Jesus is Christ*". No one can read Mr. Lewis's book and not feel the overwhelming greatness of the Apostle. It is a joy to see a book of this kind after the petty depreciations of Paul in recent years. Needless to say, the book is the work of a scholar. With but few deviations Mr. Lewis has taken Ramsay for his master and follows him throughout. But he has his own definite gift of interpretation, and this makes the book vivid and fresh. It is a convincing appraisement of Paul's genius.

The Rev. J. C. Hardwick's *No Casual Creed* (Macmillan, 5s.) is one of those books of which we have so many to-day, aimed at "the ordinary man". This is a very much better book than many of them, and does not assume that to help the ordinary man you must kick wildly over the traces. Mr. Hardwick is in some sort a modernist, and has the typical dread of what he calls dogma. But there is a foundation of belief in this book—perhaps more than the author is aware of—and though he speaks of the book as "a private view", he also says, and rightly says, that it is not *Alice Through the Looking-glass*. Very helpful are the chapters on "Prayer", and on "The Experience of God". Perhaps one may add that the one on "The Delusion of Certainty" is slight, it seems to the present writer even scientifically slight; but Mr. Hardwick will probably agree that in it he raises questions that cannot be dealt with in half a dozen pages. A sane and healthy book.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft, who succeeded Dr. John R. Mott as General Secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation, has collected in *None Other Gods* (S.C.M., 5s.) a number of papers dealing with the basis and content of the Christian life, and in the second part of the book four studies in "the foreign policy" of Christianity. The most interesting of

these four studies is that on "Christianity in the University World". The author seems to want a Christian "intelligentsia" to permeate University life; but Mr. Hardwick, in the book reviewed above, prays to be delivered from the "highbrows". It is the old question of what they had settled at the "Sorbonne". One hopes that the paper on "The Christian West" a little overdoes the tale of Christian decay and dissolution; is there not a great deal more quiet Christian faith than secretaries sometimes recognize? It has not pleased God to save the world by "movements", but by His own grace in the hearts of simple men.

Canon Peter Green, "Artifex" of the *Manchester Guardian,* is uncontrollable. He has now given us a textbook of Aesthetics under the title of *The Problem of Art* (Longmans, 6s.). It follows the plan of his book on Ethics, but "I was interested in Aesthetics", he says, "years before I knew anything of Ethics". This is not an ordinary textbook, by a long way. One need hardly say that it is readable; it is full of painted windows, of illustrations from literature and life. Canon Green says that what he has really written is a book of Christian aesthetics. I mean to enjoy this book again at my leisure.

The Rev. E. W. Burt's *After Sixty Years* (Carey Press, 2s.) is a very readable history of the work of the Baptist Missionary Society in China. It is especially welcome for its tribute to that very distinguished missionary, Timothy Richard. There is a valuable appendix giving a full list of the B.M.S. missionaries in China since Timothy Richard founded the Shantung Mission in 1875.

Mr. Douglas Dewar knows the case against evolution and he states it skilfully and with good temper in his latest book, *A Challenge to Evolutionists* (Thynne, 2s. 6d.). This is a report of the debate last February between Mr. Dewar and Mr. McCabe; but with Mr. McCabe's speeches left out, as he was unwilling to have them printed. Those who think that debates of this kind do little for the furtherance of truth will still think so after reading this book.

Mr. B. F. C. Atkinson, Under-Librarian of Cambridge University Library, is too combative to make a satisfactory historian of religion; his *Valiant in Fight* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 2s. 6d.) becomes too much like propagandism. He writes in defence of a Fundamentalism which seems taken for granted as the only true Christianity. The whole review of Christian history in this book is one-sided. The chapter on our own time is superficial, and lacks an understanding sympathy with any view but the author's own. Mr. Atkinson seems to see truth everywhere going down; and he takes refuge in "the blessed hope of the Lord's return".

The Rev. T. H. Sutcliffe's *The Prophetic Road to God* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) is a popular study of *O.T.* literature, and is especially designed for use in Tutorial classes. It is an admirable outline of the subject, free from technicalities, and at the same time a work of reliable scholarship. The book will be very useful to lay readers, as well as to students beginning their study of the *O.T.*

The Rev. F. C. Spurr's *The Evangelism for our Time* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.) is described as "a modern exposition of the technique of evangelism". It contains much practical sense on methods of evangelistic work, and is based on a wide experience.

Dr. W. B. Selbie's *Faith and Fact* (Clark, 3s. 6d.) deals with various aspects of present-day religion. These papers are all of them marked with Dr. Selbie's breadth of understanding, and they face the future. But when

Dr. Selbie says that pre-War Liberal Protestantism was complacent and spiritually bankrupt, I doubt if he can ride off quite so lightly from such a devastating statement. Very largely I agree with the statement, but this Liberal Protestantism was taught in my own college days as the last word in wisdom and light. So what? Is the new "Marxian" modernism going to be any better?

Dr. Francis Aveling's *Psychology: the Changing Outlook* (Watts, 2s. 6d.) is one of the volumes in the "Changing World Library". There is a brief outline of the chief modern schools of psychology, and at the end some applications of their principles. Necessarily the book is rather scrappy. It leaves the impression that one of the first things psychology must do is to straighten up its own house.

Dr. J. C. McKerrow's *Evolution without Natural Selection* (Longmans, 1s.) is an interesting essay, the burden of which is that "natural selection" is not needed in the picture. Between those who see natural selection everywhere, and a writer like Dr. McKerrow who has no use for it, what is the ordinary man to do?

Dr. Martin Buber's **I and Thou* has been translated from the German by Mr. R. G. Smith (Clark, 2s. 6d.) and appears for the first time in an English form. It is a remarkable piece of mystical thought, and as it becomes known it will exercise a great influence on English mysticism. The ground of reality is not in any material relation of "I and It", but in the personal relation of "I and Thou". Perhaps the most searching part of the book is that which shows how our spirituality becomes little better than a debased coinage. An original book.

A. T. S. James.

Dr. J. B. Pratt is well known to English readers through his important books on the psychology of religion, particularly by the one entitled *The Religious Consciousness,* but it is not always realized in this country that he is a philosopher as well as a psychologist. In the volume now before us (Macmillan, 15s.) he sets out the mature results of his philosophical thinking. Its title, *Personal Realism,* shows that he has departed a long way from that critical realism which he once defended and from the naturalism which was its logical conclusion. In working out his position he discusses all the questions which centre round epistemology and all the theories which further or hinder a realistic interpretation of the universe and of mind. In his last chapter, which he calls "Ultimate Guesses", he advocates a form of spiritual pantheism as being most thoroughly compatible with mystical experience, and he considers that it has "more room for both the union and the difference which mysticism demands than any other *Weltanschauung*". This is not a very satisfactory outcome of a most suggestive and stimulating book.

Dr. E. Graham Howe is a medical psychologist and the sub-title of his *War Dance* (Faber & Faber, 7s. 6d.) is "A Study of the Psychology of War". It is that, but it is also a good deal more. Dr. Howe believes that the only way to get rid of war is to discover its causes, and that these lie deeply hidden in the very constitution of man's nature and social relations. In all life there are positive and negative factors which may be so handled as to produce either harmony or discord. The handling of them is in the long run a matter for the individual, and so each man must learn to practice the art of peace in and for himself before he can hope to keep the peace with his neighbour. In working out his theme Dr. Howe covers a very wide field—metaphysics, psychology, religion, sociology,

politics, and ethics are all fish for his net. Some readers may find it difficult to follow him in all his excursions, and we cannot say that the way is made plainer by weird diagrams or by his use and discussion of dreams. At the same time we cannot but be grateful to him for a vital and original contribution to pacifist literature. There is a great deal in this book that gives furiously to think.

Dr. Ada Arlitt, the writer of *Adolescent Psychology* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.), is described as "Professor and Head of the Department of Child Cure and Training and Training School of Household Administration in the University of Cincinnati". In such a position she has no doubt had a wide experience of the ways of adolescents, and she makes good use of it in this book. It may, indeed, be described as Adolescent Psychology brought up to date. It deals in a sane, simple and comparatively untechnical fashion with all the problems of adolescence, physical, emotional, and mental, both in their normal and abnormal manifestations. It is intended mainly for teachers and contains ample references for further study of the subject. It is illustrated from statistics and case studies, and should be very useful to parents and ministers.

W. B. Selbie.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

Father Laurence Shapcote has translated some of the works of Thomas Aquinas (Burns, Oates, 2s. 6d. each): *The Three Greatest Prayers* contains the commentaries on the Lord's Prayer, The Apostles' Creed, and the Hail Mary, and *The Commandments of God* the commentaries on the Two Precepts of Charity and the Ten Commandments. The Lutterworth Press has reprinted Dr. S. G. Green's *Handbook of Church History,* condensed and with references brought up to date by Dr. Elliott-Binns (12s. 6d.). Dr. C. J. Cadoux's *Roman Catholicism and Freedom* has gone to a third edition with important supplementary notes (Independent Press, 5s.). Dr. C. H. Dodd's *The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel,* Dr. Edward Robertson's *Notes and Extracts from the Semitic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library,* and Mr. W. H. V. Reade's *Dante's Preparation for the Divine Comedy* (Manchester University Press, 1s. 6d. each) are reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.* W. E. Soothill's translation of *The Analects of Confucius,* first published in 1910, is now issued in the World's Classics (Oxford Press, 2s.) edited by his daughter, Lady Hosie, who writes a long sketch of Confucius. In the same series we have Anthony Trollope's *Phineas Redux* (2 volumes). Sheed and Ward are to be congratulated on their enterprise in printing the three parts of Mr. Alfred Noyes's *The Torchbearers* (7s. 6d.) (*The Watchers of the Sky,* 1922, *The Book of the Earth,* 1925, and *The Last Voyage,* 1930) in one volume (7s. 6d.) and on the attractive form they have given it. In the Pelican Books (Penguin Books, 6d.) we have M. Elie Halévy's *A History of the English People,* which is Book I ("Political Institutions") of Vol. I. Mr. J. Y. Simpson's *The Thoughtful Minute* (Pickering, 6d.) reprints brief articles from *The Weekly Scotsman.*

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

The Divisions of the Church (S.C.M., 1s.) is a very useful "Historical Guide" edited by the Rev. E. G. Parry for the "Friends of Reunion". Prof. C. H. Dodd's *History and the Gospel* (Spurrell, 1s.) is a Carmarthen address. Six lively pamphlets issued by the Church of Scotland's Publications Board (2d. each) are Dr. J. H. Morrison's *God and the Atom,* Dr. Hector Macpherson's *"The Heavens Declare . . .",* Prof. J. G. Riddell's

Life Here and Hereafter, the Rev. G. S. Stewart's *Prayer,* Dr. G. D. Henderson's *The Kirk Through the Centuries,* and Dr. Cromarty Smith's *Church-Going: The Why and the Wherefore.* The Swarthmore Lecture for 1937 was delivered by Miss Caroline C. Graveson and is now published under the title *Religion and Culture* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d. & 1s. 6d.). Mr. Frank Birch's *This Freedom of Ours* (Cambridge Press, 6s.) contains broadcast talks, timely and useful. *Youth and Memory* (Sheed & Ward, 6d.) is the stirring address and poem spoken by Mr. Alfred Noyes at the Empire Youth Rally on the 18th May. Mr. Godfrey Davies's *Charles Harding Firth* (Oxford Press, 1s. 6d.), reprinted from the *Proceedings of the British Academy,* is a straightforward account of the most distinguished historian of the last generation.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July). Dr. W. F. Howard contributes a very readable article on Adolf Deissmann, to whom the Rev. F. B. Clogg pays a personal tribute. Among other contributions are Mrs. Rhys David's "The History of a Symbol" and Dr. Garvie's "The Bible as Literature". Two interesting articles about John Wesley deal with his use of Matthew Prior's poems and his view of Divine Guidance.

The Hibbert Journal (July). Perhaps the most valuable contributions are Dr. Moffatt's survey of recent theological literature and Dr. C. G. Montefiore's "Liberal Christianity and Liberal Judaism", which may be summed up in the words:

> But the Liberal Jew is still unable to agree that in Jesus Christ, God's Son, "the long process of revelation reached its climax". Believing in progressive revelation, he does not dare to hold that any "climax" has been attained.

Prof. John Murray's "Germany Revisited" is informing, and there is an interesting study of Robert Boyle by Prof. L. T. More. Several articles deal with aspects of the question of race, while Dr. Edward Lyttelton, in "Multiplying Appeals for Charity" draws attention to the vast amount of money spent on cigarettes and other non-essentials.

The Baptist Quarterly (July). Dr. Whitley continues his study of "Baptists and the Bible", and the Rev. Carey Bonner his account of "Baptist Hymnists". The Rev. E. J. Roberts contributes notes on some of S. A. Tipple's sermons, and the Rev. E. H. Daniell writes on "The Lost Ending of St. Mark's Gospel". Personal articles are the Rev. E. A. Payne's account of T. J. Comber and Mr. H. N. Philcox's appreciation of William Willis, K.C. The Baptist Historical Society is to be congratulated on its activities during the year.

The Layman (July). This number recounts the activities of Baptists at home and abroad. Much of the number is taken up with impressions of the Laymen's Conference at Swanwick.

The Modern Churchman (June-July). The Bishop of Truro discusses "The Necessity of Modernism" and Mr. G. A. Byron states "A Layman's View of the Atonement". Dr. G. W. Butterworth writes on "The Interpretation of Jesus in the Creeds" and the Rev. J. Boys Smith on "The Unity of Truth".

The Expository Times (July-September). The Best Books series deals with Christian Ethics (Mr. H. G. Wood), and "Comparative Religion" (Dr. John Murphy). The Beatitudes dealt with are "The Beatitude of Security", by Dr. W. F. Lofthouse, "The Beatitude of Giving and Receiving", by Dr. Richard Roberts, and "The Beatitude of Faith in the Unseen", by Mr. H. G. Wood. Other contributions are Dr. F. A. M. Spencer's "The Ideal of Worship", Dr. S. C. Carpenter's "Spiritual Freedom", and Dr. W. M. Macgregor's "The Spirit of God".

The Christian Quarterly (July). The most important article is Mr. Charles Green's "The Church and Economics". There is a "Service of Thanksgiving for Child-birth and of the Blessing of Children".

The International Review of Missions (July). The main articles of this issue are the Rev. William Paton's on the Conferences at Oxford, Edinburgh, and Hangchow, and Dr. K. S. Latourette's "Pre-Nineteenth Century Evangelism". Two articles deal with Japan, and the late Rev. H. Gulliford discusses the future of Churches and Missions in India. The Arya Samaj statement, "Christian Missionaries—We do not want them any more", is significant.

World Dominion (July). An encouraging number which tells of the response to the preaching of the Gospel in many parts of the world, including India and Mexico, as well as of the revival of French Protestantism. An important article is the Rev. J. W. Sweetman's "A Plea for Moslem Evangelism", while Dr. Neville Bradley's "Conquest by Healing" is very well worth reading.

The Evangelical Quarterly (July). Perhaps the most interesting article is Dr. Lang's examination of the three new biographies of Calvin, Carew Hunt's, Imbart de la Tour's, and Mackinnon's. Dr. C. S. Carter deals with "The English Reformation", and Dr. W. Childs Robinson answers the question "What is Christian Faith?".

Social Service Review (June). This number has for its most important feature some statistics showing the trend of mortality rates in urban communities, with special reference to the Depressed Areas.

The Common Room (June). This issue contains some original prose and poetry by Adult Students which in itself shows the value of the work being done in Educational Settlements. The articles in this issue deal with Literature in Adult Education.

Religion in Education (July). Mr. R. F. Bailey writes on "The Fourth Gospel", and the Rev. H. K. Luce on "Religious Education in Secondary Schools". Miss Vera Walker deals with "Church History in the Day School" and Mr. J. W. E. Hall with "School Music".

The Individual Psychology Pamphlets (No. 17). Four doctors discuss "Psychotherapy in General Practice", and Dr. H. G. Baynes "The Psychological Background of the Parent-Child Relation". There is a paper by Dr. F. G. Crookshank on "Personality, Character, Life Style, and the Demands of Life".

Religion in Life (Summer, 1937). Dr. Glenn Atkins writes on D. L. Moody, and Dr. W. E. Gilroy, another Congregational contributor, contrasts the problems presented by Church Union in Canada and in the United States. An important article is Dr. Paul Tillich's "The Church and Communism", while other articles deal with "The Church and Fascism", and "The Church and Democracy". Dr. F. C. Grant writes on "Presenting Religion to Youth", and Dr. V. P. Bodein on "Walter Rauschenbusch". Dr. Edward Mack has an interesting article on "Religious Books which Endure", and the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle surveys recent British and Continental Theology.

The Yale Review (Summer). Prof. Carl Becker has a pungent article on "Loving Peace and Waging War", Mr. Grenville Clark discusses "The Supreme Court Issue", and Prof. Carl Joachim Friedrich "The Peasant as Evil Genius of Dictatorship". Prof. Merle Curti has collected a good deal of material in "Dime Novels and the American Tradition". Mr. H. M. Tomlinson has a characteristic article, "Ports of Call", and there are stories by Mr. Sean O'Casey and Mr. John Cheever.

The Harvard Theological Review (July). Mr. Campbell Bonner discusses "Some Phases of Religious Feeling in Later Paganism". Mr. W. H. P. Hatch writes on "The Subscription in the Chester Beatty Manuscript of the Harclean Gospels", and the Rev. R. V. G. Tasker on "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Cæsarean Text of John".

Anglican Theological Review (July). The Rev. Lewis J. Sherrill, in "Standards for the Christian Ministry", discusses the point raised by Mr. Bartholomew in our last number. Dr. F. C. Grant writes on "Form Criticism Farther Afield", and there are more papers on the Church Congress Syllabus, "The Basis of Christian Faith and Action Today".

The Review and Expositor (July). Two articles deal with conditions in the South States as they affect the preparation of Ministers—"Industrial and Social" on the one hand and "Racial" on the other. There is another article on "Facing Pastoral Problems" and a study, by Mr. Cornell Goerner, of "Zionism and the Scriptures".

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (May). The main article is the conclusion of the learned sketch of Illustrated Bibles. The Rev. F. W. Stewart writes on Christian Education and Evangelism, and there are appreciations of Dr. C. A. Barbour, a former president of the School.

In Extremis (No. 4). The two articles are "Notre décision politique", by J. Courvoisier-Patry, in which the parable of the unjust steward (N.B. l'économe infidèle) is applied to Christianity and politics in terms of the theology of crisis, and "Der Gehorsam des Glaubens", by Hans Burri. A Swiss Christian protest against the Government's recognition of Italian sovereignty in Abyssinia as *de jure* is reprinted.